THE HISTORY OF CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY

General Editor: Alan D. Schrift

1. Kant, Kantianism, and Idealism: The Origins of Continental Philosophy
Edited by Thomas Nenon

2. Nineteenth-Century Philosophy:
Revolutionary Responses to the Existing Order
Edited by Alan D. Schrift and Daniel Conway

3. The New Century: Bergsonism, Phenomenology, and
Responses to Modern Science
Edited by Keith Ansell-Pearson and Alan D. Schrift

4. Phenomenology: Responses and Developments
Edited by Leonard Lawlor

5. Critical Theory to Structuralism: Philosophy, Politics,
and the Human Sciences
Edited by David Ingram

6. Poststructuralism and Critical Theory's Second Generation
Edited by Alan D. Schrift

7. After Poststructuralism: Transitions and Transformations
Edited by Rosi Braidotti

8. Emerging Trends in Continental Philosophy
Edited by Todd May

THE HISTORY OF CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY

General Editor: Alan D. Schrift

VOLUME 4

PHENOMENOLOGY: RESPONSES AND DEVELOPMENTS

Edited by Leonard Lawlor

DERMOT MORAN
"Analytic Philosophy and Continental Philosophy: Four Confrontations"
PP. 235—266

ACUMEN
2010

First published in 2010 by Acumen

Acumen Publishing Limited
4 Saddler Street
Durham
DH1 3NP
www.acumenpublishing.co.uk

ISBN: 978-1-84465-214-3
ISBN: 978-1-84465-219-8 (8-volume set)

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset in Minion Pro.
Printed and bound in the UK by MPG Books Group.

CONTENTS

Series Preface vii
Contributors xiii

Introduction 1
LEONARD LAWLOR

1. Dialectic, difference, and the Other: the Hegelianizing of French phenomenology 17
JOHN RUSSON

2. Existentialism 43
S. K. KELTNER AND SAMUEL J. JULIAN

3. Sartre and phenomenology 67
WILLIAM L. MCBRIDE

4. Continental aesthetics: phenomenology and antiphenomenology 87
GALEN A. JOHNSON

5. Merleau-Ponty at the limits of phenomenology 111
MAURO CARBONE

6. The hermeneutic transformation of phenomenology 131
DANIEL L. TATE

7. The later Heidegger 157
DENNIS J. SCHMIDT

8. Existential theology 177
ANDREAS GROSSMANN

9. Religion and ethics 195
FELIX Ó MURCHADHA

10. The philosophy of the concept 217
PIERRE CASSOU-NOGUÈS

11. Analytic philosophy and continental philosophy: four confrontations 235
DERMOT MORAN

Chronology 267
Bibliography 287
Index 305

SERIES PREFACE

"Continental philosophy" is itself a contested concept. For some, it is understood to be any philosophy after 1780 originating on the European continent (Germany, France, Italy, etc.). Such an understanding would make Georg von Wright or Rudolf Carnap – respectively, a Finnish-born philosopher of language and a German-born logician who taught for many years in the US – a "continental philosopher," an interpretation neither they nor their followers would easily accept. For others, "continental philosophy" refers to a style of philosophizing, one more attentive to the world of experience and less focused on a rigorous analysis of concepts or linguistic usage. In this and the accompanying seven volumes in this series, "continental philosophy" will be understood *historically* as a tradition that has its roots in several different ways of approaching and responding to Immanuel Kant's critical philosophy, a tradition that takes its definitive form at the beginning of the twentieth century as the phenomenological tradition, with its modern roots in the work of Edmund Husserl. As such, continental philosophy emerges as a tradition distinct from the tradition that has identified itself as "analytic" or "Anglo-American," and that locates its own origins in the logical analyses and philosophy of language of Gottlob Frege. Whether or not there is in fact a sharp divergence between the work of Husserl and Frege is itself a contested question, but what cannot be contested is that two distinct historical traditions emerged early in the twentieth century from these traditions' respective interpretations of Husserl (and Heidegger) and Frege (and Russell). The aim of this history of continental philosophy is to trace the developments in one of these traditions from its roots in Kant and his contemporaries through to its most recent manifestations. Together, these volumes present a coherent and comprehensive account of the continental philosophical tradition

the relation between philosophy of the concept and the philosophy of knowledge seems to erase, is a philosophy of experience that would not be a philosophy of consciousness. This nonconsciousness philosophy of experience would be the exact counterpart to Poincaré and Bachelard's positions, which are philosophies of knowledge but also philosophies of consciousness. One example would be Merleau-Ponty's later ontology. In the notes for *The Visible and the Invisible*, Merleau-Ponty, in 1961, is one of the first, after Cavaillès, to explicitly oppose his philosophical project to the "philosophies of consciousness."[40] Another example could be Deleuze, in particular in the period of his collaboration with Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus* can hardly be seen as a philosophy of consciousness in the sense that Cavaillès rejects. But nor is it a philosophy of knowledge in the sense of Foucault's opposition.

V. CONCLUSION

We have reviewed three steps in the opposition between the philosophy of the concept and the philosophy of consciousness or the philosophy of the subject. This opposition is a polemical one, and its terms do not always have a precise meaning. Nevertheless, we have seen that each of these three steps gives different values to this opposition and delineates different responses to phenomenology. For Cavaillès, the philosophy of the concept first means a change in methodology: it is useless to investigate the becoming of science by a reflection on the acts of the subject. For Canguilhem, the philosophy of the concept seems to refer essentially to the structuralist idea that the subject is constituted as an effect of (social or psychological) structures that the subject does not determine. For Foucault, finally, the philosophy of the concept becomes the philosophy of knowledge, a philosophy that centers itself on the analysis of knowledge, in opposition to a philosophy that finds its foundations in the description of our immediate experience.

40. Merleau-Ponty, unpublished manuscript from the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. See my "La Définition du sujet dans *Le visible et l'invisible*," in *Merleau-Ponty aux frontières de l'invisible*, M. Cariou *et al.* (eds) (Milan: Mimesis, 2003).

11

ANALYTIC PHILOSOPHY AND CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY: FOUR CONFRONTATIONS

Dermot Moran

The relationships between phenomenology and the analytic tradition – the main rival to phenomenology in the twentieth century, which eventually became the dominant approach in anglophone academic philosophy – are complex and became increasingly fraught over the course of the century.[1] Early in the twentieth century, there was considerable interaction between both phenomenological and analytic European philosophers. Husserl, for instance, was one of the first philosophers to recognize the philosophical significance of Gottlob Frege (arguably the founder of analytic philosophy). Similarly, Bertrand Russell read Frege and Meinong, and corresponded with them in German; Wittgenstein moved between Austria and Cambridge; Moore read Brentano and chaired one of Husserl's lectures in London; Ryle lectured on Austrian philosophy at Oxford; Carnap attended Husserl's seminars in Freiburg in 1924–25; and so on. On the other hand, there was lack of knowledge of the different traditions: for instance, Paul Ricoeur lamented that he could find no one in Paris from whom to learn Russell's philosophy in the 1930s and Russell's *History of Western Philosophy*

1. On the development of the analytic tradition in the twentieth century, see Anat Biletzki and Anat Matar (eds), *The Story of Analytic Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1998); Juliet Floyd and Sanford Shieh (eds), *Future Pasts: The Analytic Tradition in Twentieth-Century Philosophy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Peter Hylton, *Russell, Idealism, and the Emergence of Analytic Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990); and especially the essays in Michael Beaney (ed.), *The Analytic Turn: Analysis in Early Analytic Philosophy and Phenomenology* (London: Routledge, 2007). For a discussion of the development of both traditions in the twentieth century, see my "Introduction: Towards an Assessment of Twentieth-Century Philosophy," in *The Routledge Companion to Twentieth Century Philosophy*, Dermot Moran (ed.) (London: Routledge, 2008).

(1946) is notorious for its poor treatment of European philosophers such as Nietzsche and for ignoring twentieth-century developments apart from "the Philosophy of Logical Analysis."[2]

While there was interaction and discussion between the various schools and traditions, the Second World War seemed to have had a decisive impact and, in the postwar years, the two traditions grew apart and developed separately from one another, leading eventually to a kind of *détente*, although one based largely on mutual ignorance. Karl-Otto Apel, Jürgen Habermas, and Paul Ricoeur are rare examples, in the period under discussion, of European philosophers who sought to incorporate the insights of Wittgenstein, Austin, Searle, and others. Meanwhile, anglophone analytic philosophers, especially in the 1950s and 1960s, simply paid no attention to phenomenology and its European followers.[3] It was not until the end of the 1970s that analytically trained philosophers such as Richard Rorty began to pay close attention to Husserl, Heidegger, and the phenomenological tradition.[4] The "analytic" response to phenomenology in fact has to be found largely on the European continent and then within the larger neo-Kantian tradition.

Some of the sharpest critical responses to phenomenology (primarily, the work of Husserl and Heidegger) came from within the loosely organized phenomenological movement itself; and indeed many of these criticisms anticipated those made subsequently by analytic philosophers. As Ricoeur put it, phenomenology is "both the sum of Husserl's work and the heresies issuing from it."[5] In this chapter, however, I shall be concerned with what may be broadly construed as the *analytic* reception of phenomenology. Because neo-Kantian criticisms of phenomenology in many ways anticipated and indeed inspired the analytic criticisms, it will be necessary to discuss the neo-Kantian reaction to phenomenology *en passant*. Furthermore, I will begin my narrative a little earlier than 1930, since critical responses to phenomenology began to appear especially after Husserl published his major book on phenomenological *method*, the programmatic *Ideas I* in 1913;[6] and, owing to the absolute dearth of interrelations between the

2. See Bertrand Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1946).
3. A noteworthy exception is Wilfrid Sellars, who allowed some room for phenomenology, albeit without the *Wesensschau*, and who had studied Husserl with his teacher Marvin Farber, who himself had studied with Husserl in Freiburg.
4. In this regard, Rorty's *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* groups Russell with Husserl as epistemological foundationalists and links the later Wittgenstein with Heidegger as critics of foundationalism and representationalism. [*] For a discussion of Rorty, see the essay by David R. Hiley in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 6*.
5. See Paul Ricoeur, *Husserl: An Analysis of His Philosophy*, Edward G. Ballard and Lester Embree (trans.) (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1967), 4.
6. Edmund Husserl, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy, First Book*, F. Kersten (trans.) (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1983). Since *Ideas* I was the only book Husserl published between 1901 (*Logical Investigations*) and 1929 (*Formal and Transcendental Logic*), it is impossible to overestimate its importance as *the primary* source (outside Husserl's own lectures and seminars) for those wishing to engage with his phenomenology. As such, it is cited by Carnap, Ryle, and others.
7. John Searle, "Reiterating the Differences: A Reply to Derrida," *Glyph* 1 (1977), 198.
8. Husserl originally published his *Logische Untersuchungen* in two volumes in 1900–1901. He published a revised second edition of the *Prolegomena* and the first five Investigations in 1913, and a revised edition of the Sixth Investigation in 1921, a third edition with minor changes in 1922, and a fourth edition in 1928. A critical edition, which includes Husserl's written emendations and additions to his own copies (*Handexemplar*), has appeared in the Husserliana series in two volumes: volume XVIII, *Logische Untersuchungen. Erster Band: Prolegomena zur reinen Logik. Text der 1. und der 2. Auflage*, and Volume XIX, *Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Band: Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis* (2 vols). The only English translation (of the second edition) by J. N. Findlay is *Logical Investigations*, Dermot Moran (ed.), 2 vols (London: Routledge, 2001). [*] Husserl's work is discussed in detail by Thomas Nenon in his essay in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 3*.
*9. For a detailed discussion of German and French neo-Kantianism, see the essay by Sebastian Luft and Fabien Capeillières in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 3*.

traditions during the 1960s, I will end my survey a little later than 1970 with the Searle–Derrida debate that began in 1977. I take this encounter to be one of the paradigmatic cases, although Searle himself denied that this debate represented "a confrontation between two prominent philosophical traditions."[7]

I. CHALLENGES TO PHENOMENOLOGY IN EUROPE

Phenomenology was inaugurated as a specific *method* at the outset of the twentieth century by Edmund Husserl (1859–1938), especially in the Introduction to the second volume of his massive "breakthrough" work, *Logische Untersuchungen* (*Logical Investigations*; 1900/1901).[8] Husserl systematically developed phenomenology in his subsequent publications, that is, *Ideas I* (1913), *Formal and Transcendental Logic* (1929), *Cartesian Meditations* (1931), and the articles of *The Crisis of the European Sciences* that appeared in the journal *Philosophia* (1936). In the period from 1913 to 1929, Husserlian phenomenology vied with neo-Kantianism (Windelband, Rickert, Natorp, Cassirer)[9] as the most prominent philosophical movement in Germany, with phenomenology gradually challenging and eventually eclipsing the once dominant neo-Kantian tradition, while the tradition of "life philosophy" (*Lebensphilosophie*; Dilthey, Simmel) remained a somewhat minor voice until the revival of Nietzsche's work in the 1930s. The neo-Kantians took phenomenology seriously and engaged critically with it: Paul Natorp, for instance, reviewed both Husserl's *Logical Investigations* and his *Ideas I*, and was prescient in predicting that Husserl would move closer to neo-Kantianism. When, in 1916, Husserl moved from the University of

Göttingen to take up the Chair of Philosophy in Freiburg (previously occupied by Heinrich Rickert), phenomenology became installed in the neo-Kantian heartland. In the following decade or so, from 1916 to 1928 (the year of his official retirement), Husserl established himself as the most influential philosopher in Germany. His protégé Martin Heidegger was his preferred successor and, with Husserl's support, succeeded him to the Chair of Philosophy in Freiburg in 1928. Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* (*Being and Time*; 1927), which Husserl himself had arranged to be published in his *Jahrbuch*, had immediate impact, but the ground for his fame had already been prepared by his lectures at Marburg (1923–28), which had already made him famous with a generation of students, as Hannah Arendt would later recall.[10]

Heidegger's own intellectual formation owed much not only to Catholic neo-Thomism (through which he encountered Brentano's work on Aristotle, which led him to Husserl),[11] but also to neo-Kantians such as Rickert (his *Doktorvater*) and Emil Lask. Despite his ten-year exposure to Husserl, in his magnum opus Heidegger deliberately linked phenomenology to hermeneutics, as found in the German tradition of Schleiermacher and Dilthey, as well as drawing on Kierkegaard's and Jaspers's existentialism, and thereby changed phenomenology radically from within. Presuppositionless, descriptive eidetic insight, gained under the rigorous application of the *epochē*, gave way to interpretation, historical situatedness and an appreciation of human finitude and of the anxiety involved in personal existence. Husserl's term "consciousness" (*Bewusstsein*) was replaced by Heidegger's "Dasein" (existence).[12] Soon after, with the publication of *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, Heidegger deliberately distanced himself from neo-Kantianism, very publicly in his famous Davos debate with Ernst Cassirer in 1929.[13]

When he eventually came to read *Being and Time* in 1929, Husserl was deeply disturbed by Heidegger's distortion of transcendental phenomenology. He was also especially disturbed after he read Georg Misch's 1931 study, *Lebensphilosophie und Phänomenologie*,[14] which discussed Husserl, Heidegger, and Dilthey in terms that suggested it was Heidegger who was the leading new voice of hermeneutical phenomenology insofar as he had absorbed the best impulses of life philosophy: the attempt to grasp life itself. Husserl embarked on a series of responses to the Heideggerian challenge that culminated in his 1936 *The Crisis of the European Sciences*.[15] But his young assistant Eugen Fink also sought to defend Husserl's phenomenology against its critics – in particular in his 1933 *Kant-Studien* article "The Phenomenological Philosophy of Edmund Husserl and Contemporary Criticism,"[16] which Husserl himself explicitly endorsed – in which he responded to the accusation that with *Ideas I*, Husserl had drawn closer to neo-Kantianism.

By 1930, phenomenology had become something of an orthodoxy in Germany and was already beginning to experience a backlash. Thus, for example, Max Horkheimer, in his speech inaugurating the newly emerging Frankfurt School, had characterized phenomenology as belonging to "traditional" rather than "critical" theory.[17] The neo-Kantians, following Rickert, had renewed their attack on phenomenology, precisely because they claimed there was no pure given back to which phenomenological intuition could turn. They were effectively challenging what Sellars would later call the "myth of the given." Scheler's sudden death in 1928 and Heidegger's "turning" (*die Kehre*) away from the constraints of academic philosophy during the 1930s also contributed to the decline of phenomenology, as did the Nazi purge of Jewish academics from the universities. Even younger German philosophers sympathetic to phenomenology – including Gadamer and Fink – believed that Husserlian phenomenology needed to be wedded to something more fundamental: in Gadamer's case, it was hermeneutics and the nature of language; in Fink's, it was Hegelian speculation.

After the Second World War, interest in phenomenology sharply declined in Germany. Husserl had died in isolation in 1938; Heidegger was under a teaching

10. See Hannah Arendt, "Martin Heidegger at Eighty," *New York Review of Books* (October 1971); reprinted in *Heidegger and Modern Philosophy*, Michael Murray (ed.) (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978), esp. 293.
11. See Martin Heidegger, "My Way to Phenomenology," in *The Phenomenology Reader*, Dermot Moran and Tim Mooney (eds) (London: Routledge, 2002).
12. For an interesting discussion of the relation between Husserl's and Heidegger's conceptions of phenomenology, see Steven Galt Crowell, *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Space of Meaning: Paths toward Transcendental Phenomenology* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2001), and his essay "Does the Husserl/Heidegger Feud Rest on a Mistake? An Essay in Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology," *Husserl Studies* 18 (2002). See also Theodore Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's* Being and Time (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993).
13. For Heidegger's debate with Cassirer, see Martin Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, Richard Taft (trans.) (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990), 171–85.
14. Georg Misch, *Lebensphilosophie und Phänomenologie: Eine Auseinandersetzung der Dilthey-schen Richtung mit Heidegger und Husserl* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1931). Misch, Dilthey's son-in-law, sent a copy of his book to Husserl, who was deeply disturbed to find that his version of phenomenology was presented in a bad light in contrast with Heidegger's absorption of Dilthey.
15. For Husserl's responses to Heidegger, see Edmund Husserl, *Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology and the Confrontation with Heidegger (1927–31), The Encyclopaedia Britannica Article, The Amsterdam Lectures "Phenomenology and Anthropology" and Husserl's Marginal Notes in* Being and Time, *and* Kant on the Problem of Metaphysics, Thomas Sheehan and Richard E. Palmer (trans.) (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1997).
16. Eugen Fink, "The Phenomenological Philosophy of Edmund Husserl and Contemporary Criticism," in *The Phenomenology of Husserl: Selected Critical Readings*, R. O. Elveton (ed.) (Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books, 1970).
17. See Max Horkheimer, "Traditional and Critical Theory," in *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, Matthew J. O'Connell *et al.* (trans.) (New York: Seabury Press, 1968).

suspension and was giving private talks on German poets such as Hölderlin; Fink was developing his own philosophy, writing about Nietzsche; Gadamer was developing hermeneutics (and reviving Hegel); and critical theory would eventually be revived when exiled members of the Frankfurt School (including Adorno) returned to Germany. In addition, emerging young philosophers such as Habermas were shocked by Heidegger's lack of self-questioning regarding his National Socialist activities, as instanced by the fact that in his published 1935 lectures *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger had left standing remarks concerning the "inner truth and greatness" of National Socialism.[18] Moreover, Heidegger's invocation of "metaphysical" concepts such as the "being of beings" was considered anathema by philosophers who follow the positivist rejection of metaphysics as nonsense. Phenomenology's legacy was now tainted both by Heidegger's connection with fascism and by the unfashionable specter of reviving metaphysics!

As we have seen, phenomenology was being challenged in Germany by neo-Kantian and Frankfurt School thinkers during the 1930s–1950s. But phenomenology also came under attack from various offshoots of the neo-Kantian tradition, especially the Vienna Circle movement that gradually evolved into logical positivism.[19] I will now turn to the analytic challenge to phenomenology, which I will present in the form of four paradigmatic confrontations.

II. FOUR CONFRONTATIONS

The first confrontation: phenomenology (Husserl) and Viennese logical positivism (Schlick) plus neo-Kantianism (Natorp and Rickert)

Phenomenology, itself the child of the Austrian tradition of philosophy founded by Bolzano and Brentano,[20] did have a specific line of influence in Vienna

18. See Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (trans.) (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 213. Habermas's review of the 1953 Heidegger lectures can be found as Jürgen Habermas, "Martin Heidegger: On the Publication of the Lectures of 1935," in *The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader*, Richard Wolin (ed.) (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993).
19. On the complex history of the Vienna Circle, logical positivism and logical empiricism, see Thomas Uebel, "On the Austrian Roots of Logical Empiricism: The Case of the First Vienna Circle," in *Logical Empiricism: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, Paulo Parrini *et al.* (eds) (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003), and Alan Richardson and Thomas Uebel (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Logical Empiricism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
20. See Barry Smith, *Austrian Philosophy: The Legacy of Franz Brentano* (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1994).

during the development of logical positivism.[21] Felix Kaufmann (1895–1949),[22] a graduate in jurisprudence and an enthusiastic reader of Husserl's phenomenology, attended meetings of the circles around Hans Kelsen (his doctoral supervisor), the economist Von Mises, and the group that eventually became known as the Vienna Circle. Kaufmann had a significant influence on the social phenomenology of the young Alfred Schutz,[23] and his book on the *Infinite in Mathematics and its Exclusion* (1930)[24] was highly regarded by Husserl. Kaufmann often discussed Husserl at meetings of the Vienna Circle (supposedly much to the annoyance of Schlick and some others) and also wrote on the relations between phenomenology and logical empiricism. In 1938, Kaufmann emigrated to the United States where, as an academic (teaching law and philosophy) at the New School for Social Research, he wrote several papers on the relation between phenomenology and analysis and, indeed, debated with his fellow émigré Rudolf Carnap on the nature of induction and truth in the pages of the newly founded *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*.[25] It is clear that Carnap respects Kaufmann and that Kaufmann was recognized as an influential mediator between phenomenology and the emergent logical positivist tradition.[26] In particular, Kaufmann defended Husserl's concept of *Wesensschau* against Moritz Schlick's criticisms (which I will discuss below), and argued that Husserl's concept of evidence (*Evidenz*) had been misunderstood by those critics who regarded it as a subjective feeling of certainty.

During the early 1930s, critical philosophical responses to phenomenology came especially from Vienna Circle logical positivists such as Schlick and

21. See the essays collected in Arkadiusz Chrudzimski and Wolfgang Huemer (eds), *Phenomenology and Analysis: Essays on Central European Philosophy* (Frankfurt: Ontos, 2004). See also Friedrich Stadler (ed.), *The Vienna Circle and Logical Empiricism: Re-evaluation and Future Perspectives* (New York: Springer, 2004) and Stadler, *The Vienna Circle – Studies in the Origins, Development, and Influence of Logical Empiricism* (Vienna: Springer 2001).
22. See Harry P. Reeder, "Felix Kaufmann," in *The Encyclopedia of Phenomenology*, Lester Embree *et al.* (eds) (Boston, MA: Kluwer, 1997). See also Wolfgang Huemer, "Logical Empiricism and Phenomenology: Felix Kaufmann," in *The Vienna Circle and Logical Empiricism*, Stadler (ed.).
23. On the influence of Kaufmann on Schutz, see Michael D. Barber, *The Participating Citizen: A Biography of Alfred Schutz* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2004), 16–17.
24. For an English translation, see Felix Kaufmann, *The Infinite in Mathematics*, Brian McGuinness (ed. and trans.) (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1978).
25. See Rudolf Carnap, "Remarks on Induction and Truth," Felix Kaufmann, "On the Nature of Inductive Inference," and Rudolf Carnap, "Rejoinder to Mr. Kaufmann's Reply," all in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 6(4) (June 1946). The dispute was reviewed by Carl Hempel in "Review of Carnap-Kaufmann Debate," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 11(4) (1946).
26. See especially Felix Kaufmann, "Phenomenology and Logical Empiricism," in *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*, Marvin Farber (ed.) (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940). For a full list of his works, see Harry P. Reeder, "A Chronological Bibliography of the Works of Felix Kaufmann," appendix in Kaufmann, *The Infinite in Mathematics*.

Carnap.[27] Admittedly, Schlick had already challenged Husserl's phenomenology in the first edition (1918) of his *Allgemeine Erkenntnislehre* (*General Theory of Knowledge*).[28] Husserl responded to Schlick's criticisms in the foreword to his second edition of the Sixth Investigation (which was published as a separate volume in 1921). Here Husserl asserts that many criticisms drawn from outside phenomenology fail to understand the effect that bracketing has on one's opinions and convictions. He dismisses as absurd the view that Schlick attributes to him:

> How readily many authors employ critical rejections, with what conscientiousness they read my writings, what nonsense they have the audacity to attribute to me and to phenomenology are shown in the *Allgemeine Erkenntnislehre* of Moritz Schlick. On page 121 of that work it is said that my *Ideas* "asserts the existence of a particular intuition, that is *not a real psychic act*, and that if someone fails to find *such an 'experience,' which does not fall within the domain of psychology*, this indicates that he has not understood the doctrine, that he has not yet penetrated to the correct attitude of experience and thought, for this requires 'peculiar, strenuous studies.'" The total impossibility that I should have been able to utter so insane an assertion as that attributed to me by Schlick in the above italicized sentences, and the falsity of the rest of his exposition of the meaning of phenomenology, must be plain to anyone familiar with this meaning.[29]

The tone of Husserl's dismissal of Schlick indicates that there is a certain hostility in his attitude to him. Husserl is incredulous that Schlick apparently believes that his eidetic intuition is not also a real psychic act. Husserl goes on to remark: "I must expressly observe that, in the case of M. Schlick, one is not dealing with irrelevant slips, but with sense-distorting substitutions on which all his criticisms are based."[30] Husserl is particularly annoyed that a doctrine of special

27. Moritz Schlick (April 14, 1882–June 22, 1936; born in Berlin, Germany; died in Vienna, Austria) was educated at the University of Berlin. His influences included Carnap, Planck, and Wittgenstein, and he held appointments at the University of Vienna.
28. The second edition of Schlick's *Allgemeine Erkenntnislehre* is translated as *General Theory of Knowledge*. Schlick dropped most of the Husserl discussion and condensed his criticisms into a single paragraph in the second edition; Moritz Schlick, *General Theory of Knowledge*, A. E. Blumberg and H. Feigl (trans.) (Chicago, IL: Open Court, 1985), 139. For an interesting discussion, see Roberta Lanfredini, "Schlick and Husserl on the Essence of Knowledge," in *Logical Empiricism*, Parrini *et al.* (eds).
29. Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, vol. 2, 179.
30. *Ibid.*

or indeed mystical intuition is being attributed to him and to phenomenology. Husserl believes the meaning of the *epochē* has been completely misunderstood by Schlick. Phenomenology is not a Platonic gazing at essences given in a kind of intellectual intuition; it is based on hard work, akin to mathematics.

In fact, Schlick had been targeting Husserl's account of essential intuition (*Wesensschau*) in the *Logical Investigations* from as early as 1910.[31] In general, Schlick was opposed to the idea that *knowledge* (which he conceived of as essentially propositional) could be any kind of intuition. As he puts it in a 1932 paper, "Form and Content: An Introduction to Philosophical Thinking": "Intuition is enjoyment, enjoyment is life, not knowledge."[32] For him, the pure content of intuitive experience was inexpressible. He writes, "The difference between structure and material, between form and content is, roughly speaking, the difference between that which can be expressed and that which cannot be expressed."[33] And he goes on to say: "Since content is essentially incommunicable by language, it cannot be conveyed to a seeing man any more or any better than to a blind one."[34] For Schlick, one can *see* a green leaf and *say* that one sees the green leaf, but one's saying it does not communicate the intuitive *content* "green." This is his position *against* phenomenology. Schlick maintained that all knowing involved seeing-as and hence conceptualizing and judging. Pure intuiting, for Schlick, could not have the status of knowing. Ironically, Schlick does not challenge Husserl on the basis of any kind of verificationism. Both Husserl and Schlick were advocates of kinds of empiricism whereby knowledge is founded on perceptual experience, but Husserl always rejected positivism on the grounds that it overly narrowly restricted the content of experience (to sense data) and did not grasp the nature of what Husserl termed "categorial intuition."

Nevertheless, the brief but acrimonious debate between Husserl and Schlick more or less set the tone for future confrontations between phenomenology and the nascent analytic movement. Schlick returned to attack Husserl's phenomenology again in 1930, this time attacking Husserl's defense of synthetic *a*

31. See Paul Livingston, "Husserl and Schlick and the Logic of Experience," *Synthese* 132(3) (2002). Schlick targets Husserl in his 1910 essay "Das Wesen der Wahrheit nach der modernen Logik," *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie* 34 (1910); published in English as "The Nature of Truth in Modern Logic," in *Moritz Schlick: Philosophical Papers*, vol. 1, Henk L. Mulder and Barbara F. B. Van de Velde-Schick (eds) (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1979). For further discussion of the Schlick–Husserl relationship, see Jim Shelton, "Schlick and Husserl on the Foundations of Phenomenology," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 48 (1988), which itself is a response to M. Van de Pitte, "Schlick's Critique of Phenomenological Propositions," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 45 (1984).
32. Moritz Schlick, "Form and Content: An Introduction to Philosophical Thinking," in *Moritz Schlick: Philosophical Papers*, Mulder and Van de Velde-Schick (eds), vol. 2, 323.
33. *Ibid.*, 291.
34. *Ibid.*, 295.

priori propositions (Husserl's "material a priori"), which Schlick regarded as empty tautologies, rather than significant eidetic insights.[35] For Schlick, as for logical positivism in general, there is no synthetic *a priori*. Schlick followed Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* in holding that *a priori* statements were simply tautologies and as such did not "say" anything. For Husserl, on the other hand, there are certain truths that are *a priori* but that depend on the nature of the *matter* in question.[36] Thus, something being blue and at the same time yellow is not, for him, a purely formal truth based solely on the law of noncontradiction, but rather an *a priori* synthetic truth grounded in the essential nature of color as essentially dependent on surface. Interestingly, as we will see below, the mature Wittgenstein would side with Husserl against Schlick on this issue of the synthetic *a priori*.[37]

Husserl may have been particularly irked by Schlick precisely because the latter was repeating a criticism of phenomenology's reliance on intuition that was to be found not just in the nascent logical positivist tradition to which Schlick belonged but also in orthodox neo-Kantianism. For neo-Kantianism, it was a matter of orthodoxy that intuitions without concepts were blind. Prominent German neo-Kantians of the day, including Rickert and Natorp, as well as other prominent philosophers such as Hans Cornelius (one of Adorno's teachers), had also criticized phenomenology's assumptions concerning pure unmediated givenness. Phenomenology was seen as a new form of irrational or nonconceptual intuitionism, and, as such, would be doomed to failure. Indeed, Rickert and others said as much in their criticisms of Husserl.

It is one of the ironies of the history of philosophy that in his early lectures at Freiburg, Heidegger, himself a student of Rickert, takes up the challenge of defending phenomenological intuition against both Natorp and Rickert. In his 1919 lecture course, "The Idea of Philosophy and the Problem of Worldview," Heidegger takes issue with Natorp's criticism that phenomenology's claim to be founded in immediate intuition is bankrupt since all immediacy has to be *mediated* by concepts and since consciousness, which is the basis for all objectification, is itself something that escapes determination. For Natorp, original experience can at best be "theoretically regained" or "reconstructed" by some

35. Moritz Schlick, "Gibt es ein materiales Apriori?" (1930), published in English as "Is there a Factual a priori?," in *Moritz Schlick: Philosophical Papers*, Mulder and Van de Velde-Schick (eds), vol. 2, 161–75. The original paper appeared in a Viennese philosophy journal in 1930/1931 and is reprinted in Schlick, *Gesammelte Aufsätze 1926–1936* (Vienna: Gerold, 1938). The German title of the paper actually refers to Husserl's concept of the "material *a priori*."

36. For a recent discussion, see Jocelyn Benoist, *L'A priori conceptuel: Bolzano, Husserl, Schlick* (Paris: Vrin, 1999). Benoist carefully distinguishes the question of the nature of analyticity (as raised by Quine) from the question of the nature of the synthetic *a priori*.

*37. For a discussion of the transformation from the early to the late Wittgenstein, see the essay by Bob Plant and John Fennell in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 3*.

kind of working back through the original "construction" process whereby the experience was subsumed under generalizing concepts.[38] Natorp, then, challenges the view that phenomenology can recover direct unmediated experience. Phenomenology can at best be a "reconstruction" of experience.[39]

Against Natorp's critique, the young *Privatdozent* Heidegger defends phenomenological viewing by arguing that conceptual description is in fact founded in an original experience that is originally *nontheoretical* in character.[40] Furthermore, it is a mistake to consider phenomenological "signification" to be itself another kind of standpoint; it is in fact the attempt to free thinking from standpoints. The "original sin" against phenomenology, as Heidegger puts it in the same lecture course, is to assume that the phenomenological stance is merely another standpoint.[41] For Heidegger, phenomenological meaning-apprehension goes along with the life process itself and grasps the essential "worldliness" of experience in a nonfalsifying way. According to Heidegger, now embarking on his own original conception of phenomenology, phenomenology essentially operates with what he terms in 1919 "hermeneutical intuition" (*hermeneutische Anschauung*).[42] Heidegger is, as we can clearly see, already on the road to the hermeneutic transformation of Husserlian descriptive phenomenology.

In later lecture courses, Heidegger offers a similar defense of phenomenology against his former teacher Rickert. In agreement with Natorp, Rickert also maintained that experience necessarily involves conceptualization and he would soon afterward (in 1920) publish a virulent critique of the "vitalism" of the then popular life philosophy (which Rickert understood broadly as including Nietzsche, Simmel, Dilthey, Bergson, Scheler, *et al.*) on the grounds that life had

38. See Heidegger's critique of Natorp in his 1919 lecture course, in Martin Heidegger, *Towards the Definition of Philosophy*, Ted Sadler (trans.) (London: Continuum, 2002), 87–8; in his collected works, *Gesamtausgabe* 56/57 (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1987), 103–5.

39. Natorp had been a major influence on Husserl and reviewed both Husserl's *Logical Investigations* and *Ideas I*. They were in regular correspondence until Natorp's death in 1924. Natorp reviewed the first volume of the *Investigations – Prolegomena to Pure Logic* – favorably in *Kant Studien* in 1901, portraying Husserl as broadening the essentially Kantian inquiry into the necessary conditions of the possibility of experience. See Paul Natorp, "Zur Frage der logischen Methode. Mit Beziehung auf Edmund Husserls Prolegomena zur reinen Logik," *Kant Studien* 6 (1901), 270ff.; published in English as "On the Question of Logical Method in Relation to Edmund Husserl's *Prolegomena to Pure Logic*," J. N. Mohanty (trans.), in *Readings on Edmund Husserl's Logical Investigations*, J. N. Mohanty (ed.) (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977).

40. Heidegger, *Towards the Definition of Philosophy*, 94; *Gesamtausgabe* 56/57, 111.

41. Heidegger, *Towards the Definition of Philosophy*, 93; *Gesamtausgabe* 56/57, 109. Interestingly, at various points in his own lecture courses, Husserl himself designated the original sin of philosophy as the fall into psychologism and naturalism.

42. Heidegger, *Towards the Definition of Philosophy*, 99; *Gesamtausgabe* 56/57, 117.

to be conceptualized in order to be understood.[43] Rickert attacks those supposed life philosophers who argue for the need to remain "true to life." This is simply impossible for Rickert, since reality is grasped not just through sense impressions, but is mediated through language. Language, with its generalizations and "species names," is, according to Rickert, precisely a necessary reduction of the complexity of the world of sensuous experience. It is conceptualization that brings order and system into the world of sensory experience that otherwise would be a chaos of fleeting sensations (as Kant had pointed out). Rickert concludes that "what is directly experienced as reality cannot be known. Thus, there is no metaphysics of life. ... Life, as the unmediated reality, can only be lived through. As immediate life it mocks any attempt to get to know it."[44] Of course, Rickert shared Husserl's disdain for what they regarded as irrationalist "life philosophy," brimming with "enthusiasm" but lacking solid argumentation and conceptualization. Indeed, it was largely owing to Heidegger and Jaspers that more existentialist figures such as Kierkegaard and Nietzsche were reclaimed by the philosophical tradition. Scheler too had been responsible for a new appreciation of the role of personhood, emotions and feelings, in philosophy, but neo-Kantianism resisted the lure of life philosophy and continued to insist that the business of philosophy was the clarification of scientific knowledge, not the celebration of life. Even the term *Erlebnis*, dear to both Dilthey and Husserl, is a concession to vitalism, according to Rickert, and he identifies and criticizes the urge toward life that is to be found in Heidegger's philosophy (inspired by Dilthey).

The attack of the positivists was essentially a reprise of the original criticisms of phenomenology made by the neo-Kantians. Yet Husserl remained well disposed to the neo-Kantians, especially Natorp. During his Freiburg years, he also maintained formal but cordial relations with Rickert and corresponded with him frequently. Indeed, as he pointed out to Rickert, both were in agreement in opposing the increasingly dominant naturalism. Both phenomenology and neo-Kantianism understood philosophy to be primarily an *a priori* and transcendental enterprise and resisted all attempts at naturalism. On the other hand, Husserl was more antagonistic toward the new positivism. Having originally been an admirer of Ernst Mach, one of the forerunners of the Vienna Circle, and having characterized phenomenology, with its unprejudiced viewing, as

43. See Heinrich Rickert, *Die Philosophie des Lebens: Darstellung und Kritik der philosophischen Modeströmungen unserer Zeit* [The philosophy of life: Exposition and critique of the fashionable currents of contemporary philosophy] (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1922).

44. The German reads: "... was als Realität unmittelbar erlebt wird, kann nicht erkannt werden. Also gibt es keine Metaphysik des Lebens. ... Das Leben als das unmittelbar Reale lässt sich nur erleben. Es spottet als unmittelbares Leben jedem Erkenntnisversuch" (Rickert, *Die Philosophie des Lebens*, 113; my translation).

the genuine positivism in *Ideas I* §20, in later years Husserl went on to claim in *The Crisis of the European Sciences* that "positivism, in a manner of speaking, decapitates philosophy,"[45] by ignoring the role of the subject in the constitution of knowledge.

The second encounter: Carnap reads Husserl and Heidegger

The second encounter between phenomenology (this time represented by Husserl and Heidegger) and analytic philosophy (this time represented by Carnap) was even sharper in tone than the earlier dispute between Husserl and Schlick. Heidegger's famous *Antrittsrede*, "What is Metaphysics?," delivered at the University of Freiburg in July 1929, was deliberately provocative and evoked very strong reactions. Carnap, who was present at the talk, was, reputedly, appalled by Heidegger's claims. His reply, entitled "The Overcoming of Metaphysics Through the Logical Analysis of Language," appeared in the new journal of the logical positivists, *Erkenntnis*, volume 2, in 1931.[46] Carnap's essay was actually a programmatic manifesto against traditional metaphysics involving the supposed demonstration of the meaningless of metaphysical claims based on a "logical analysis" of meaning. With this essay, the battle between a certain tendency in phenomenology (regarded by Carnap as a kind of obscurantism) and logical analysis (later transformed into "analytical philosophy") had begun.[47] Indeed, the journal *Erkenntnis* had been explicitly founded by Carnap and Reichenbach to preach the logical positivist message and explicitly advocate "scientific philosophy."[48] Carnap's attack on Heidegger was in effect a deliberate declaration of war, just

45. Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, David Carr (trans.) (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970), 9.

46. Originally translated as "The Elimination of Metaphysics Through Logical Analysis of Language," in *Logical Positivism*, A. J. Ayer (ed.) (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1959), this translation has been reprinted – with a more accurate title – as "The Overcoming of Metaphysics Through Logical Analysis of Language," in *Heidegger and Modern Philosophy*, Murray (ed.).

47. For a discussion of some of these battles see the essays in Parrini *et al.* (eds), *Logical Empiricism*; see especially Gottfried Gabriel, "Carnap's 'Elimination of Metaphysics through Logical Analysis of Language': A Retrospective Consideration of the Relationship between Continental and Analytic Philosophy."

48. As Carl Hempel recalled in 1975, "The old *Erkenntnis* came into existence when Hans Reichenbach and Rudolf Carnap assumed the editorship of the *Annalen der Philosophie* and gave the journal its new title and its characteristic orientation; the first issue appeared in 1930. The journal was backed by the Gesellschaft für Empirische Philosophie in Berlin ... and by the Verein Ernst Mach in Vienna, whose philosophical position was strongly influenced by that of the Vienna Circle; a brief account of these groups, and of several kindred schools and trends of scientific and philosophical thinking, was given by Otto Neurath in 'Historische Anmerkungen' [vol. 1, 311–14]" (Carl Hempel, "The Old and the New '*Erkenntnis*,'" *Erkenntnis* 9 [1975]).

as Heidegger's own Inaugural Address was meant to challenge both Husserl and neo-Kantianism.

For subsequent followers of analytic philosophy, Carnap's essay has been seen as effectively unmasking Heidegger's nonsense (literally). Indeed, the significance of Carnap's criticisms of Heidegger may be compared with Heidegger's own criticisms of Cassirer in his famous Davos debate of 1929. Just as Heidegger's debate with Cassirer had the eventual result of elevating phenomenology over neo-Kantianism in Germany, Carnap's debate with Heidegger had the eventual result of elevating analytic philosophy over Heideggerian phenomenology in the anglophone world.[49]

In fact, however, Carnap was actually much closer to Husserlian phenomenology than many analytic philosophers have been willing (until recently, for example, in the work of Michael Friedman[50]) to acknowledge. Carnap had been a student of the neo-Kantian philosopher Bruno Bauch at Freiburg, and had even attended Husserl's seminars in 1924–25, when he was living near Freiburg and assembling the material that would become *Der logische Aufbau der Welt* (The logical construction of the world; 1928).[51] Carnap became associated with the Vienna Circle after he moved to take up a position in Vienna in 1926, introduced through his friend Hans Reichenbach.[52] In 1929, Carnap, along with Hans Hahn and Otto Neurath wrote the manifesto of the Vienna Circle, which aimed at propagating a "scientific conception of the world [*wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung*]" in opposition to traditional metaphysical and theological worldviews.[53] This manifesto suggested that the survival of metaphysical outlooks could be explained by psychoanalysis or by sociological investigation,

49. Carnap participated in the debate at Davos. Michael Friedman claims that Carnap's virulent attack on Heidegger in "Overcoming Metaphysics Through the Logical Analysis of Language" essay grew directly out of his encounter with Heidegger in Davos in 1929 (*A Parting of the Ways. Carnap, Cassirer, and Heidegger* [La Salle, IL: Open Court, 2000], x).

*50. See, for example, the essay by Michael Friedman and Thomas Ryckman in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 3*.

51. The translation of "*Aufbau*" as "Structure" is less apt than "Construction." Hereafter cited as *Aufbau* followed by the section number and the page number in the English translation (see Rudolf Carnap, *The Logical Structure of the World and Pseudo Problems in Philosophy*, Rolf A. George [trans.] [London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967]). For an interesting study of Carnap, see Alan Richardson, *Carnap's Construction of the World: The* Aufbau *and the Emergence of Logical Empiricism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

52. See Thomas Uebel, "Carnap and the Vienna Circle," in *The Cambridge Companion to Rudolf Carnap*, R. Creath and M. Friedman (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

53. See Friedrich Stadler, "The Vienna Circle: Context, Profile, and Development," in *The Cambridge Companion to Logical Empiricism*, Richardson and Uebel (eds).

but most advanced was the "clarification of *the logical origins of metaphysical aberration,* especially through the works of Russell and Wittgenstein."[54]

Husserl, Heidegger, and Carnap all shared a view of philosophy as attempting to clarify certain basic matters and getting beyond certain traditional philosophical problems that they regarded as "pseudo-problems" (*Scheinprobleme*).[55] Husserl himself often made derogatory remarks about "windy metaphysics" not grounded in intuition and indeed his clarion call "to the things themselves" was meant to be a repudiation of metaphysical speculation. So the rejection of metaphysics alone did not single out Carnap's approach from that of the phenomenologists. Furthermore, Carnap cited Husserl in positive terms in several places in the *Aufbau*, as he had earlier done in his dissertation published as *Der Raum* (1922), where he discusses Husserl's views on the intuited nature of space.[56] There is even some debate about the extent of Husserl's influence, especially on Carnap's central conception of "construction" (*Aufbau*). Carnap certainly played down the influence in later years but it is clear that, in the mid-1920s, he was well disposed toward the Freiburg phenomenologist.

In general, the *Aufbau* shows strong neo-Kantian influences, although Carnap is also deeply in debt to the new Russellian "logistics," which he regards as the "most comprehensive" (*Aufbau* §3). Following on from the tradition of Meinong, Husserl, and others, who were also seeking a "theory of objects," Carnap is seeking to identify various forms of object and begins broadly from the division between physical objects, psychological objects, and cultural objects. Like Husserl, Carnap operates with a very wide conception of an "object" – an object is anything about which a statement can be made (and hence includes relations, events, etc.). Carnap confirms the positive connection between his approach and Meinong's theory of objects as well as Husserl's "mathesis of experiences" (as he finds explicated in Husserl's *Ideas I*).[57]

Analytic philosophers may be surprised to learn that Carnap even invokes Husserl's *epochē* approvingly in *Aufbau* §64. In speaking about beginning from one's personal experiences (which Carnap, adapting the term "methodological

54. See Rudolf Carnap, Hans Hahn, and Otto Neurath, "The Scientific Conception of the World: The Vienna Circle," in *Philosophy of Technology: The Technological Condition, An Anthology*, Robert C. Scharff and Val Dusek (eds) (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 230.

55. For a discussion of the relation between Heidegger and Carnap see Abraham D. Stone, "Heidegger and Carnap on the Overcoming of Metaphysics," in *Martin Heidegger*, Stephen Mulhall (ed.) (London: Ashgate, 2006).

56. See Richardson, *Carnap's Construction of the World*, 153–4. Carnap wanted to maintain both that purely geometrical space was a formal construct, derivable from mathematics, and that physical space was experienced in intuition, albeit it in a limited way.

57. Carnap, *Logical Structure of the World*, 9. Carnap refers to Husserl's *Ideas I* (1913), §75, but this does not seem to be the right reference for "*mathesis*."

individualism," calls "methodological solipsism"), Carnap says that he will suspend belief as to whether the beliefs are actual or not:

> At the beginning of the system, the experiences must simply be taken as they occur. We shall not claim reality or nonreality in connection with these experiences; rather, these claims will be "bracketed" (i.e., we will exercise the phenomenological "withholding of judgment", *epochē*, in Husserl's sense (*Ideas* I §§31, 32).[58]

Interestingly, perhaps inspired by the Humean approach (which Husserl himself, following Brentano, adopted in the first edition of the *Logical Investigations* until convinced by Natorp of the need to recognize the "I"), Carnap believes that original experiences are given in a non-egoic manner (*Aufbau* §65). They do not have to be related to a "subject" or a "self," concepts that Carnap believes are higher "constructions" in his sense. Some kind of "I-relatedness" is not an original property of the basic experiences, Carnap claims, since to invoke the "I" is already to invoke "others" and these are higher-order entities, outside the original given. Departing from the mature Husserl of *Ideas I* (who had restored the pure ego as the transcendental source of all experience), Carnap believes that the assumption that experiences must be related to a subject is actually a prejudice driven by the subject–predicate structure of our language. Carnap acknowledges that in divorcing experiences from subjects he is departing from certain philosophical "systems," including that of Husserl (Carnap refers to *Ideas I*, 65; presumably §37).[59] The *Aufbau* then offers the kind of building-up or construction of objects from experiences that Husserl's phenomenology also tried to trace, but it does so by avoiding the introduction of the pure or transcendental ego.[60]

58. Carnap, *Logical Structure of the World*, 101.
59. *Ibid.*, 106.
60. In an illuminating article, Abraham Stone has summarized the correlations between Husserl and Carnap in the *Aufbau* as follows: "Carnap's initial realm of the 'autopsychological' clearly corresponds (as he explicitly points out [*Logical Structure*, §64]) to Husserl's region of pure consciousness; its fundamental objects are called *Erlebnisse*. Next comes the physical realm, where, as in Husserl, the fundamental objects are 'things.' Carnap even follows Husserl on the detailed steps by which such 'things' are constituted: first, a level of visual things (*Sehdinge*), i.e., mere colored surfaces moving in space (Husserl, *Ideas* I, §151; Carnap, *Logical Structure*, §128); then, a narrowly 'physical' level of quantitative description in which movement is determined by strict causal law (Husserl, *Ideas* I, §52; Carnap, *Logical Structure*, 180–82); finally, the level of 'intersubjective' objects (though in this case, as both make clear, there is a kind of interweaving by which higher-order, psychological objects are used to complete the constitution of lower-order, physical ones) (Husserl, *Ideas* I, §151; Carnap, *Logical Structure*, §§148–9). After the physical realm comes a 'heteropsychological' one (corresponding to Husserl's psychological region), and finally a realm or realms of *Geist*. Carnap follows Husserl, moreover, in referring to the process responsible for this structure, by which one object is founded on another, as *Konstitution* (Carnap, *Logical Structure*, §§1–2)" (Stone, "Heidegger and Carnap on the Overcoming of Metaphysics," 230). Stone's page references are to the 1974 German edition of the *Aufbau*.

In his 1931 article "Overcoming Metaphysics," Carnap continues in the spirit of the Vienna Circle manifesto to apply the methods and procedures of the new logic (which Heidegger himself had written about as early as 1912) to show that Heidegger's "metaphysical" claims about nothingness were not just false but literally *nonsensical*. It is worth noting that Heidegger is but one target of Carnap's analysis. Carnap makes clear that he could have drawn his nonsensical statements from any one of a number of "metaphysicians" and, indeed, those cited in the paper include Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and Bergson, as well as Heidegger. Carnap uses the concept of "pseudo-statements" in order to criticize Heidegger. A "pseudo-statement" is a sentence that has a surface grammatical sense but which on analysis turns out not to assert anything that is meaningful (capable of verification) and hence that is literally meaningless. As Carnap puts it, such pseudo-sentences accord with "historical-grammatical syntax" but violate "logical syntax."

In "Overcoming Metaphysics," Carnap argues that there is a fault in human language that admits sentences (both meaningful and meaningless) that possess the same "grammatical form." Carnap suggests that sentences in Heidegger's 1929 essay – Carnap places Heidegger in "the metaphysical school" – such as "The Nothing nothings" (*Das Nichts selbst nichtet*) bear a superficial grammatical resemblance to acceptable sentences such as "The rain rains."[61] But this sentence is misleading because, Carnap asserts, "nothing" cannot function like a name. He points to the difference between the "is" of predication (e.g. "he is hungry") and the "is" of existence (e.g. "he exists") and asserts that the correct logical form of the "is" of existence is that it is applicable only to predicates, and not to signs for objects. Carnap writes:

> To be sure it has been known for a long time that existence is not a property (see Kant's refutation of the ontological proof of the existence of God). But it was not until the advent of modern logic that full consistency on this point was reached: the syntactical form in which modern logic introduces the sign for existence is such that it

61. Heidegger's text is quoted by Carnap: "What is to be investigated is being only and – *nothing* else; being alone and further – *nothing*; solely being, and beyond being – *nothing. What about this nothing? ... Does the Nothing exist only because the Not, i.e., the Negation, exists?* Or is it the other way around? *Does Negation and the Not exist only because the Nothing exists? ...* We assert: *the Nothing is prior to the Not and the Negation ...* Where do we seek the Nothing? How do we find the Nothing ... We know the Nothing. ... *Anxiety reveals the Nothing. ... What about this Nothing – The Nothing itself nothings* [*Das Nichts selbst nichtet*]" ("The Overcoming of Metaphysics Through Logical Analysis of Language," 24).

> cannot, like a predicate, by applied to signs for objects, but only to predicates ...[62]

This extends the Frege–Russell treatment of the existential quantifier. According to Carnap in his essay "Overcoming Metaphysics," Heidegger makes the logical mistake "of employing the word 'nothing' as a noun [*Gegenstandsname*]" instead of recognizing it is a negative existential sentence or assertion. Carnap's approach, of course, is precisely an application of Russellian logical analysis (as exemplified by Russell in his "On Denoting" [1905]) to a typical sentence of metaphysics to show that its apparently meaningful grammatical form masks an underlying logical nonsense.

Carnap's attack on Heidegger has been seen in some analytic circles as devastating. His views were popularized in the anglophone world by A. J. Ayer, especially in his *Language, Truth and Logic*, published in 1936, shortly after Carnap's visit to London. But the original target for the logical positivists had been Hegel and, when logical positivism moved to Britain, neo-Hegelians such as Bradley and Greene.[63] Carnap's article, however, went much further in its attacks, not just targeting Hegel (who also writes about the Nothing), but even criticizing Descartes for his supposed pseudo-statement "I am," presented as the conclusion of his *cogito ergo sum*. Most analytic philosophers would not follow Carnap in his analysis of the supposed logical flaw in Descartes's famous dictum, yet he was treated as having effectively dismissed Heidegger.[64] In fact, between the 1930s and the 1970s, analytic philosophy was largely defined by its overt hostility to all forms of metaphysics, but the situation has changed rapidly since the 1970s and something called "analytic metaphysics" – inspired by the work of Roderick Chisholm, Peter Strawson, David Lewis, David Armstrong, and others – is now a leading branch of analytic philosophy. Moreover, Carnap's rejection

62. *Ibid.*, 28.

63. In *Language, Truth and Logic* (1936), for instance, A. J. Ayer quotes a sentence from Bradley's *Appearance and Reality* as nonsensical: "the Absolute enters into, but is itself incapable of, evolution and progress." In the same work, Ayer also criticizes Heidegger's assumption that "Nothing" is "a name which is used to denote something peculiarly mysterious," but he himself makes clear that he is repeating Carnap's analysis in his "Overcoming Metaphysics" article of 1931. See A. J. Ayer, *Language, Truth and Logic*, 2nd ed. (New York: Dover, 1952), 36.

64. In large part, the debate between phenomenology and logical positivism was about the meaning and status of the *a priori*. As Friedman, among others, has pointed out, Carnap's reaction to phenomenology, and indeed to Heidegger, was complex. Husserl's account of the *a priori* comes close to that of the logical positivists. Of course, both Carnap and Heidegger had received their initial training in neo-Kantianism. See Friedman, *A Parting of the Ways*, and his essay "A Turning Point in Philosophy: Carnap-Cassirer-Heidegger," in *Logical Empiricism*, Parrini *et al.* (eds); see also Gabriel, "Carnap's 'Elimination of Metaphysics Through Logical Analysis of Language.'"

of Heidegger has in fact been revisited by analytic philosophers, many of whom now acknowledge the limitations of Carnap's approach.

In 1935, Carnap delivered three lectures in London, published as *Philosophy and Logical Syntax*. In these lectures, he states that the only proper task of philosophy is logical analysis and offers as his example the logical analysis of metaphysics. Carnap defines metaphysical statements as follows: "I will call metaphysical all those statements which claim to represent knowledge about something which is over or beyond all experience, e.g., about the Essence of things, about Things in themselves, the Absolute, and such like."[65] He includes statements by ancients such as Thales ("the Essence and Principle of the world is water"), Heraclitus, Anaximander, Pythagoras, and Plato, as well as moderns such as Spinoza, Schelling, Hegel, and Bergson. According to Carnap, all the statements of metaphysicians of this kind have no empirical content, hence no possibility of being verified and are thereby literally nonsensical. The supposed problems of metaphysics were, for him, in reality pseudo-problems. Carnap does allow for metaphysical statements to have a function, namely, an expressive one, similar to the function of "lyrical verses": "The metaphysician believes that he travels in territory in which truth and falsehood are at stake. In reality, however, he has not asserted anything, but only expressed something, like an artist."[66]

Although Heidegger never directly replied to Carnap, he does seem to have been affected by Carnap's criticism. Thus, in his 1943 "Postscript to 'What is Metaphysics?'" Heidegger insisted that one of the chief "misconceptions" concerning his position was that it "declares itself against 'logic.'"[67] Heidegger goes on to claim that logic has degenerated into "logistics" and that "exact thinking" is not really the most rigorous or penetrating form of thinking: "exact thinking merely binds itself to the calculation of beings."[68] Calculative thinking is in pursuit of mastery; in opposition to this, there is another form of thinking, which Heidegger here calls "essential thinking," whose aim it is to find the word that speaks "the truth of being." The question "How is it with the nothing?" is not a question of logic. The "nothing" is more originary than the logical concepts of "not" and negation. The fundamental mood of anxiety reveals the nothing in a

65. Rudolf Carnap, *Philosophy and Logical Syntax*, excerpts reprinted in *Twentieth-Century Philosophy: The Analytic Tradition*, Morris Weitz (ed.) (New York: Free Press, 1966), 209–10.

66. Carnap, "The Elimination of Metaphysics Through Logical Analysis of Language," 79. Interestingly, in these lectures, Carnap takes issue with Wittgenstein's claim in the *Tractatus* that his own statements were without sense. For Carnap, the sentences of the *Tractatus* have sense as logical analysis but not as a competing metaphysics.

*67. For further discussion of Heidegger's early work on logic, see the essays by Miguel de Beistegui and Babette Babich in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 3*.

68. Martin Heidegger, "Postscript to 'What is Metaphysics?,'" in *Pathmarks*, William McNeill (ed.) (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 235.

way that is more primordial. Heidegger simply shifts the ground for the entire discussion. Issues from within formal logic cannot affect a kind of thinking that is more originary than logic.

The third encounter: Cambridge (Wittgenstein) and Oxford (Ryle) consider phenomenology

In general Ludwig Wittgenstein[69] seems to have been uninterested in phenomenology, just as he was uninterested in or impatient with other philosophical movements of the time – including the logical positivists, whom he himself had influenced and who continued to admire him, even after he had abandoned the position that they embraced! There have been suggestions that his work of philosophical clarification has much in common with the kind of method pursued by Husserl in his *Logical Investigations*, but the precise nature of Wittgenstein's knowledge of that book has not been established.[70] Occasionally, especially in the late 1920s and early 1930s, Wittgenstein employed the term "phenomenology" in a positive sense, with an entire chapter of his so-called "Big Typescript" (1933) entitled "Phenomenology is Grammar."[71] Similarly, in some remarks made in 1929, Wittgenstein offered apparently sympathetic reflections on Heidegger's *Being and Time*, wherein he recognized the importance of "anxiety" or "dread" (*Angst*) and related the notion of the experience of astonishment concerning the experience of running up against the limits of language.[72] In remarks that were recorded by Friedrich Waismann, Wittgenstein said:

> I can readily think what Heidegger means by Being and Dread. Man has the impulse to run up against the limits of language. Think, for example, of the astonishment that anything exists. This astonishment cannot be expressed in the form of a question, and there is also no answer to it. Everything which we feel like saying can, a priori, only be nonsense. Nevertheless, we do run up against the limits of language. … This running up against the limits of language is *Ethics*. I hold that it is truly important that one put an end to all the idle talk about Ethics – whether there be knowledge, whether there can be values, whether the Good can be defined, etc.[73]

Heidegger had discussed the nature of *Angst* in *Being and Time* §40, but he returned to it also in his July 1929 lecture "What is Metaphysics?," which we have already discussed. Around this time also, in 1930, Wittgenstein made a comment, recorded by his friend Maurice O'Connor Drury, concerning Schlick's upcoming presentation at the Moral Science Club in Cambridge, where he had been asked to speak about phenomenology. Wittgenstein commented acidly: "You ought to make a point of going to hear this paper, but I shan't be there. You could say of my work that it is 'phenomenology.'"[74] In several of his remarks, Wittgenstein speaks of a kind of phenomenology of color experiences, for instance, that cannot be contradicted by physics; and he acknowledges the appeal of phenomenology in his *Remarks on Color*. But more than that, in his later career Wittgenstein was developing an appreciation for *a priori* synthetic propositions that Schlick has explicitly rejected as part of the phenomenologist's toolbox.

Meanwhile, at Oxford, the ordinary-language philosopher Gilbert Ryle (1900–1976),[75] who was responsible for lecturing on phenomenology and Austrian philosophy, had his own way of reading Husserl and others.[76] Initially, Ryle was reasonably well disposed toward phenomenology, both for its descriptions of conscious states and for its conception of philosophy as independent of the sciences. But by the late 1930s, he had come to reject it in favor of a kind of linguistic behaviorism that repudiated most "internalist" accounts of the stream of consciousness.

*69. For a detailed discussion of Wittgenstein, see the essay by John Fennell and Bob Plant in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 3*.

70. See Merrill B. Hintikka and Jaakko Hintikka, *Investigating Wittgenstein* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).

71. For a full discussion of Wittgenstein's relation to phenomenology see N. F. Gier, *Wittgenstein and Phenomenology: A Comparative Study of the Later Wittgenstein, Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1981); but see also his "Wittgenstein's Phenomenology Revisited," *Philosophy Today* 34(4) (1990), and "Never Say Never: A Response to Harry P. Reeder's 'Wittgenstein Never Was a Phenomenologist,'" *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 22(1) (January 1991).

72. See Ludwig Wittgenstein, "On Heidegger on Being and Dread," in *Heidegger and Modern Philosophy*, Michael Murray (ed.). The original German text entitled "Zu Heidegger," is to be found in Brian F. McGuinness, *Ludwig Wittgenstein und der Wiener Kreis* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2001), 68–9.

73. See Wittgenstein, "On Heidegger on Being and Dread," 80–81.

74. See Maurice O'Connor Drury, "Conversations with Wittgenstein," in *Personal Recollections of Ludwig Wittgenstein*, Rush Rhees (ed.) (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1981), 131. See also Herbert Spiegelberg, "Wittgenstein Calls his Philosophy 'Phenomenology,'" *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 13(3) (October 1982).

75. Ryle was a graduate of Oxford in classics and philosophy, who spent his entire academic life at Christ Church, and he eventually became Waynflete Professor of Metaphysical Philosophy.

76. For an interesting discussion of Ryle's reading of phenomenology, see Amie L. Thomasson, "Phenomenology and the Development of Analytic Philosophy," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 40 (2002 Supplement).

Very early in his lecturing career, Ryle reviewed Husserl's Polish student Roman Ingarden's *Essential Questions* (*Essentiale Fragen*)[77] in *Mind* in 1927 and Heidegger's *Being and Time*[78] in *Mind* in 1929, just two years after that work had originally appeared in German, and, in 1929, he even visited Husserl in Freiburg and discussed phenomenology with him.[79] Ryle initially seemed to have been quite favorably disposed to phenomenology, which he saw as offering the same kind of conceptual analysis that he favored. In 1932, Ryle contributed a fairly detailed article explaining phenomenology to the *Supplementary Volume* of the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*,[80] and his later articles on phenomenology (especially his review of Husserl's American student Marvin Farber's *The Foundations of Phenomenology*[81]) are extremely valuable and insightful with regard to the initial reception of phenomenology in the anglophone world.[82] In his 1932 article "Phenomenology," Ryle points out that phenomenology, which he defines as the "science of the manifestations of consciousness," is not to be confused with phenomenalism. He explains Brentano and his fellow phenomenologists as asking the question: "What is it to be a case of remembering, judging, inferring, wishing, choosing, regretting, etc.?" (CP1 167). This, for Ryle, is a *conceptual question* totally distinct from empirical inquiries into what causes one to remember, and so on. Ryle therefore explicitly endorses the phenomenologists' separation of their discipline from empirical psychology. He further agrees with Husserl that the discipline of phenomenology is *a priori*. Phenomenology, for Ryle, is a kind of *a priori* conceptual analysis. He disagrees, however, with Husserl's claim that phenomenology is a rigorous science, since Ryle simply thinks that philosophy generally, as the "analytic investigation of types of mental functioning," has nothing to do with science: "Philosophical methods are neither scientific nor unscientific" (CP1 168). Philosophy is *sui*

77. See Gilbert Ryle, "Review of Roman Ingarden's *Essentiale Fragen: Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Wesens*," *Mind* 36 (1927).
78. See Gilbert Ryle, "Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*," *Mind* 38 (1929): 355–70; reprinted in Ryle, *Collected Papers, Volume One: Critical Essays* (London: Hutchinson, 1971). Hereafter Ryle, *Collected Papers, Volume 1* will be cited as CP1.
79. See Karl Schuhmann, *Husserl-Chronik: Denk- und Lebensweg Edmund Husserls* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977), 340.
80. Gilbert Ryle, "Phenomenology," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Supplementary Volume 11 (1932); reprinted in CP1.
81. Gilbert Ryle, "Review of Marvin Farber: *The Foundations of Phenomenology*," *Philosophy* 21 (1946); reprinted in CP1.
82. In the postwar years, Ryle became more emphatic in his criticisms of many aspects of phenomenology's manner of proceeding. While Ryle's quirky writing style may sound today somewhat chauvinistic in its championing of Anglo-Saxon values over those he styles "Teutonic," there is no doubt that he makes every effort to understand phenomenology as well as to criticize it.

generis, although that does not mean that it is occupied with special sorts of entities such as abstract objects, sense data, and other philosophical terms of art.

Interestingly, in endorsing Husserl's *apriorism*, Ryle agrees with Husserl's opposition to various forms of naturalism and empiricism. Ryle further agrees with Husserl that philosophy should not engage in the construction of speculative systems. While he does find some metaphysical constructions in Husserl, Ryle goes on to assert: "But with his [Husserl's] official view, that the business of philosophy is not to give new information about the world but to analyze the most general forms of what experience finds to be exemplified in the world, I completely agree" (CP1 170).

On the other hand, Ryle explicitly disagrees with Husserl's account of ideal entities (abstract objects, propositions, and so on), which he thinks is close to Meinong's. He opposes the view that one can have essential or eidetic insight in the manner of a supposed direct inspection of essences. As Ryle sees it, Husserl often speaks as if one simply inspects or "constatates" (Ryle's word) essences.[83] This is misleading because he also talks about identifying the eidetic laws. Ryle writes:

> Philosophy is, accordingly, a kind of observational science (like geography); only the objects which it inspects are not spatio-temporal objects but semi-Platonic objects which are out of space and time. These are correlates to acts of conception and judgment, though whether it is essential to them to be so correlative or whether it is accidental is left rather obscure by Husserl's writings. (*Ibid.*)

Ryle supposes that Husserl conceives these ideal objects as something independently subsisting (akin to Meinong), although for Ryle, Husserl is not clear enough on this point. In his later writings on phenomenology, Ryle continues to dismiss Husserl's Platonism concerning these ideal entities (CP1 219). He believes it is both an "impropriety" and a "nonsense" to speak of seeing essences in this manner (CP1 220). Taking his cue from the later Wittgenstein, Ryle notes that "we elucidate their significations by fixing the rules of their uses and not by any operation of gazing at any wearers of labels" (CP1 221). For Ryle, thought does not begin with a vocabulary and then develop a syntax; rather, "its vocabulary is syntactical from the start." In his 1946 review of Farber's *The Foundations of Phenomenology*, Ryle is more emphatic:

> The proprietary method claimed for Phenomenology is a sham, and Phenomenology, if it moves at all, moves only by the procedures by

83. See Ryle, "Review of Marvin Farber," CP1 221.

> which all good philosophers have always advanced the elucidation of concepts, including consciousness-concepts. Husserl's practice bears this out. He does often produce acute original and illuminating elucidations of such concepts. (*Ibid.*)

Ryle concedes that Husserl engages in conceptual clarification, but in general, as he puts it in his review of Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*, he fears that the phenomenological approach will end in a "windy mysticism." In "Phenomenology," Ryle thinks that Husserl does not have to cling to the doctrine of eidetic intuition. Indeed, for Ryle, the main doctrine of phenomenology is the thesis that all consciousness is consciousness of something; in other words, that all consciousness is intentional, or, in Ryle's terms, "transitive" (CP1 171). Although he is deeply interested in Husserl's account of intentionality, Ryle ends up criticizing its conception of mental acts as "consciousness-of." Rather, Ryle thinks (following the former Wykeham Professor of Logic, John Cook Wilson's views), mental acts such as believing involve reference to *knowledge*; and hence "knowledge-of" should replace Husserl's locution of "consciousness-of." In his "Phenomenology" of 1932, we already see phenomenology being criticized from the standpoint of the newly emerging analytic philosophy of language. Furthermore, Ryle is explicitly unhappy with Husserl's turn to a kind of "egocentric metaphysic" (CP1 174), having gone beyond its original purpose of providing conceptual analyses of mental acts or states.[84]

In his main work, *The Concept of Mind* (1949), Ryle rejected all philosophical efforts to postulate an ego or Cartesian-style mind as some kind of "ghost in the machine," favoring instead a behaviorist, "dispositionalist" account of sentences that purported to involve mental predicates. Ryle writes:

> It is being maintained throughout this book that when we characterize people by mental predicates, we are not making untestable inferences to any ghostly processes occurring in streams of consciousness which we are debarred from visiting; we are describing the ways in which those people conduct parts of their predominantly public behavior.[85]

As a result, Ryle was characterized as a logical behaviorist and his views strongly influenced his student Daniel Dennett, who employs the Rylean strategy of the "category mistake" to diffuse ontological commitments with regard to mental entities.[86] Ryle was now rejecting the very concept of a stream of consciousness and was advocating that our mental categories (what he calls "category habits") be replaced by new "category disciplines" that are purged of Cartesian myth. Ryle's views on the ego, of course, are actually not far removed from those of Jean-Paul Sartre, especially as given in his 1936 essay *The Transcendence of the Ego*, where Sartre too tries to dissolve reference to the ego in sentences such as "I am chasing a street-car." For Sartre, the immediate conscious experience has the form "street-car to be chased." Ryle's criticism of Husserlian approaches to consciousness, then, might not have extended to all phenomenology's exponents. The problem with the encounter between phenomenology and ordinary-language philosophy as exemplified by Ryle at Oxford, is that the confrontation was one-sided. The phenomenologists and their continental followers rarely showed interest in what was happening in the anglophone world. For all intents and purposes, Wittgenstein, Carnap, Feigl, and others, were completely absorbed into anglophone, Anglo-American philosophy, and their roots in European thought were ignored until a new subject, the history of analytic philosophy, emerged in the 1980s.[87]

The fourth dimension: John Searle and Jacques Derrida arguing over Austin

The fourth paradigmatic encounter I will discuss in this essay is the confrontation that took place between the American philosopher John R. Searle and the French philosopher Jacques Derrida in the late 1970s. While this is somewhat outside the parameters of the historical period under consideration in this volume, it has to be acknowledged that the 1960s perhaps represents a particularly barren period in terms of the relations between analytic and continental philosophy (understood here as the legacy of phenomenology) generally. On the one hand, it was only in the postwar years that many of the classics of the continental

84. In the 1950s, Ryle participated in the famous Royaumont conference in France, along with Merleau-Ponty. Unfortunately, there does not appear to have been much useful exchange of views. In the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, Ayer, who was stationed in Paris attached to the British Embassy, and Merleau-Ponty were known to have had lengthy conversations and to have radically disagreed. In one encounter in 1951, recorded by Georges Bataille, Ayer, Bataille, and Merleau-Ponty took opposing sides on the meaning of a sentence such as the "sun existed before humans were on earth," with Ayer insisting it was completely meaningful and Bataille being incredulous. Unfortunately, we know little more about these conversations. See A. J. Ayer, *Part of My Life: The Memoirs of a Philosopher* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), 285. For an interesting analysis of the Ryle–Merleau-Ponty debate, see Juha Himanka, "Does The Earth Move? A Search for a Dialogue between Two Traditions of Contemporary Philosophy," *The Philosophical Forum* 31(1) (Spring 2000), esp. 58–9.

85. Gilbert Ryle, *The Concept of Mind* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1949), 51.

86. See, for instance, Daniel C. Dennett, *Content and Consciousness* (London: Routledge, 1969).

87. A milestone in the development of the history of analytic philosophy was Michael Dummett's *Origins of Analytical Philosophy*, originally delivered as lectures in Bologna in 1987.

tradition – Husserl's *Logical Investigations* (translated 1970), Heidegger's *Being and Time* (translated 1962), Sartre's *Being and Nothingness* (translated 1958), and Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception* (translated 1962) – first began to be discussed seriously in the anglophone world. Philosophers such as John Wild, J. N. Findlay, Hazel Barnes, and others played an important intermediary role here. On the other hand, a growing hostility to continental philosophy and an increasing insistence that philosophy *as such* was analytic become particularly strident in the English-speaking world during that decade. Philosophically, the 1960s is a period of apartheid and separate development, and it is difficult if not impossible to find a fruitful encounter between analytic philosophy and phenomenology. Within the analytic tradition there were lone voices – such as those of P. F. Strawson (defending descriptive metaphysics), and Wilfrid Sellars – that were relatively favorably disposed to certain kinds of post-Kantian philosophy,[88] but there was no serious effort to engage with phenomenology or its continental followers.

Hence the need to look to the 1970s to round off our narrative. The confrontation that I want to consider ostensibly took place over Derrida's interpretation of the Oxford philosopher's John Austin's account of performatives, but it reaches to the very heart of Searle's and Derrida's versions of what constituted the nature of language, the practice of philosophy, and indeed the standards governing textual interpretation. This debate continues to generate controversy as to its importance for the confrontation between so-called "analytic" and "continental" ways of philosophizing, and represents a convenient place for us to end our story in this essay.

Searle studied at Oxford in the 1950s with Austin and others. He initially worked on philosophy of language and became well known for his book *Speech Acts* (1969), which systematized Austin's work on performatives and other kinds of illocutionary acts. In Europe, Searle's work had a strong influence on both Habermas and Apel. Searle then moved to write on issues in the philosophy of mind and especially on the nature of intentionality. Searle's *Intentionality* (1983) is modeled on his earlier analysis of speech acts. Just as, in speech acts, there is a distinction between *propositional content* and *illocutionary force*, in intentional states there is a similar distinction to be found between the propositional content and its propositional attitude or what Searle terms "psychological mode." Searle claims that in researching his book *Intentionality*, he could find nothing useful in the analytic literature:

88. See, for instance, Peter Strawson, *The Bounds of Sense* (London: Methuen, 1966), and Wilfrid Sellars, *Science and Metaphysics: Variations on Kantian Themes* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968).

> So I turned to the phenomenologists, and the book that I was urged to read was Husserl's *Logical Investigations*. Well, I read the First Logical Investigation, and, frankly, I was very disappointed. It seemed to me that it was in no way an advance on Frege and was, in fact, rather badly written, unclear, and confused. So I abandoned the effort to try to learn something about intentionality from previous writers and just went to work on my own. ... I learned nothing from Husserl, literally nothing, though, of course, I did learn a lot from Frege and Wittgenstein.[89]

Searle, then, claims to have rediscovered intentionality and to have made it intelligible within analytic philosophy of mind without further reference to the phenomenological tradition.

In contrast to Searle's, Derrida's intellectual formation came primarily through his engagement with the phenomenology of Husserl and Heidegger in particular. He wrote three early, formative studies on Husserl.[90] Derrida's work was deeply inspired by a "linguistic turn" that took place in French philosophy in the 1960s largely through the influence of Heidegger's later essays on language, on the one hand, and the renewed interest, starting with the later Merleau-Ponty, in the protostructuralist linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure, on the other.[91] While most often associated with poststructuralism, by his own account, Derrida remained deeply indebted to Husserlian phenomenology and the practice of the *epochē* in particular.

> It is true that for me Husserl's work, and precisely the notion of *epochē*, has been and still is a major indispensable gesture. In everything I try to say and write the *epoché* is implied. I would say that I constantly try to practice that whenever I am speaking or writing.[92]

89. John Searle, "The Phenomenological Illusion," in *Experience and Analysis: Erfahrung und Analyse*, Maria E. Reicher and Johann C. Marek (eds) (Vienna: OBV and HPT, 2005), 320.
90. Derrida's three major Husserl studies (written in 1953/4, 1962, and 1967, respectively) are: *The Problem of Genesis in Husserl's Philosophy*, Marian Hobson (trans.) (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2003); *Edmund Husserl's Origin of Geometry: An Introduction*, John P. Leavey, Jr. (trans.) (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1989); and *Speech and Phenomena*, David B. Allison (trans.) (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1972).
91. For a discussion of Derrida's philosophical formation and influences, see my *Introduction to Phenomenology* (London: Routledge, 2000), 435–73. [*] See also the essay on the linguistic turn in continental philosophy by Claire Colebrook in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 6*.
92. Jacques Derrida, "Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility," in *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley (eds) (London: Routledge, 1998), 81.

Derrida's controversy with Searle was occasioned by the publication of an English translation of his essay "Signature Event Context" in the first issue of a new journal of textual studies from Johns Hopkins University – *Glyph* – in 1977.[93] As Searle recalls, there was a reading group at Berkeley, of which he was a part, and someone proposed reading this Derrida essay. He was very critical of the paper and was invited to submit his comments to the new journal. His reply, "Reiterating the Differences: A Reply to Derrida," appeared in the same volume of *Glyph*.[94]

In his original paper, Derrida offers a complex and often enigmatic discussion of Austin's use of performatives. Derrida's paper in general is a meditation on the supposed centrality of the communicative function of language and involves discussion of the views of Condillac (taken as maintaining the classical view of language as a representation of ideas) and Husserl, as well as Austin. Derrida's topic is the multiple nature or "polysemy" of communication, and his essay introduces many of his more familiar themes, including *différance*, the absence of the signified, and so on. Indeed, part of his aim is to explain and apply aspects of Husserl's analysis of language. Sentences (even observational sentences) have sense even apart from the experience that is being described. The experience may be absent. Similarly, in written language, the "speaker" may be absent. A key feature of linguistic acts is their "iterability," by which Derrida means that linguistic statements need to be repeatable and be able to function outside their immediate context, and especially beyond the purview of the immediate range of receivers, listeners, readers, and so on.

The essay begins with a short quotation from Austin's *How to Do Things with Words* (1962), where Austin states that for simplicity he will restrict his discussion to *spoken* utterances, and indeed literal speech, excluding such things as an actor pronouncing words on stage, or other "parasitic" forms, such as playful speech, metaphors, and so on. Austin writes: "Language in such circumstances is in special ways – intelligibly – used not seriously, but in ways *parasitic* on its normal use – ways which fall under the doctrine of the *etiolations* of language."[95]

93. Derrida's essay was originally delivered as a paper at a Canadian conference in 1971, whose overall theme was "communication," and was published in *Marges de la philosophie* in 1972.
94. See Jacques Derrida, "Signature Event Context" and John Searle, "Reiterating the Differences: A Reply to Derrida," both in *Glyph* 1 (1977). Derrida in turn replied to Searle in "Limited Inc.," *Glyph* 2 (1978). See also John Searle, "The World Turned Upside Down," in *Working through Derrida*, Gary B. Madison (ed.) (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993). The papers of the Derrida–Searle exchange are all reprinted in Jacques Derrida, *Limited Inc.*, Samuel Weber *et al.* (trans.) (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988). This debate has engendered an enormous critical literature including articles by Richard Rorty, Stanley Cavell, and others.
95. J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard in 1955*, J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa (eds) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 22.

In his essay, Derrida challenges the view that there is a single meaning to communication, and indeed points to the complex nature of what is supposed under the notion of "literal meaning" and the complexities introduced by metaphorical uses of language. For Derrida, the true complex nature of language where metaphor, and so on, are in play from the beginning is being ignored here, making Austin's otherwise interesting analysis beside the point. Derrida carefully focuses on Austin's apparently innocent use of the metaphorical term "parasitical," which suggests that metaphorical and analogical uses of language are extensions of the basic literal function of language, as if that "literal" function was itself perfectly clear. Metaphor, fiction, and so on, are seen by Austin and others as some kind of (perhaps dispensable) add-on to the literal use of language.[96]

In his reply, Searle simply dismissed Derrida's interpretation of Austin as a misunderstanding, owing, he claims, mostly to Derrida's ignorance of post-Wittgensteinian developments in linguistics and the philosophy of language. Searle denies that iterability is a specific feature of written rather than spoken language. Rather, permanence is what distinguishes the written mark. In reply, Derrida claims he has been misunderstood, his statements taken out of context, ignoring the larger claims of his other work, and so on. Derrida's evasion, his play on the very notion of seriousness in philosophy, all indicate that he was not seeking to seriously engage with his opponent. Searle regarded his "debate" with Derrida as a non-event and refused to continue it. He later commented:

> With Derrida, you can hardly misread him, because he's so obscure. Every time you say, "He says so and so," he always says, "You misunderstood me." But if you try to figure out the correct interpretation, then that's not so easy. I once said this to Michel Foucault, who was more hostile to Derrida even than I am, and Foucault said that Derrida practiced the method of *obscurantisme terroriste* (terrorism of obscurantism). We were speaking French. And I said, "What the hell do you mean by that?" And he said, "He writes so obscurely you can't tell what he's saying, that's the obscurantism part, and then when you criticize him, he can always say, 'You didn't understand me; you're an idiot.' That's the terrorism part." And I like that. So I wrote an article about Derrida.[97]

96. For a criticism of Austin/Searle and an argument in support of Derrida in this regard, see Jonathan Culler, "Convention and Meaning: Derrida and Austin," in *Contemporary Literary Criticism*, R. C. Davis and R. Schleifer (eds) (New York: Longman, 1989).
97. John Searle, "Reality Principles: An Interview with John R. Searle," interview with Steven R. Postrel and Edward Feser, *Reason Online* (February 2000), http://reason.com/archives/2000/02/01/reality-principles-an-intervie (accessed June 2010).

III. CONCLUSION: MORE OF THE SAME

To be sure, the context of analytic philosophy had changed considerably as the Wittgenstein of the *Philosophical Investigations* replaced the earlier Wittgenstein of the *Tractatus*.[98] Where the backdrop to Carnap's approach had been the *Tractatus* view, the backdrop to the Oxford ordinary-language philosophy of Ryle and Austin – which Searle encountered in the 1950s – was the view that what ordinary speech enshrines makes sense and is somehow "right." Nevertheless, the exchange between Searle and Derrida in many ways resurrects a point at issue between earlier opponents such as Heidegger and Carnap; namely, whether language can be exact and also precisely refer to the real world in some literal way. Both Carnap and Searle begin from the literal use of language, which they see as fundamental to science as the articulation of truth. Both Heidegger and Derrida, on the other hand, see language as essentially and inescapably symbolic and metaphorical. For them, the *poetic* function is not one function among many of language, but is rather the primary force that makes language possible at all. It is precisely because language points beyond itself and indeed beyond what is immediately indicated that it is capable of functioning for the transmission of meaning. At the time of his dispute with Heidegger, Carnap was trying to fix the meanings of language, or at least to have a scientific language that was logically purified and unambiguous and which picked out the one true world (although later Carnap moved to recognize the multiplicity of irreducible "conceptual schemes," as his pupil Hilary Putnam terms them). Heidegger, on the other hand, was growing increasingly dissatisfied with the stultified language of the philosophical tradition and wanted to exploit the poetic resources and ambiguities in language, especially the German and ancient Greek languages, as ways of expressing the manner in which Being reveals and conceals itself across history.

In what has come to be known as analytic philosophy generally, enormous emphasis is placed on the values of clarity, accuracy, precision, and rigor in argumentation. From that point of view, Heidegger and Derrida are seen as needlessly obscure, engaged in "rhetoric" or literary allusion, offering bad arguments or even no arguments at all. Indeed, as we have quoted above, Searle even used the phrase (which he claims he took from Foucault's assessment of Derrida) "terrorist obscurantism." Even Rorty, who agrees with much of what Derrida has to say, is quite willing to concede that "Searle is … right in saying that a lot of Derrida's arguments … are just awful."[99] On the other hand, Heidegger,

98. Wilfrid Sellars spoke about Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* having moved analytic philosophy from its Humean to its Kantian phase.

99. Richard Rorty, "Deconstruction and Circumvention," in *Essays on Heidegger and Others: Philosophical Papers II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 93–4.

as we also saw, regarded such demands for exactitude as part of calculative rather than originary thinking. Phenomenology privileged eidetic insight and description over argumentation. Of course, the later Wittgenstein had a similar view of philosophy as presenting a particular view on matters or perhaps escaping from the grip of a prevailing mistaken picture of things. This does not require argumentation but rather what Husserl would call a "change of attitude" (*Einstellungänderung*) or what Thomas Kuhn would call a "paradigm shift."

There is no doubt that there is obscurity in Derrida and Heidegger; but this is seen as necessary in relation to the complexity of the thought and its need to break its relation to its tradition. Rigorous argumentation, moreover, is but one aspect of philosophical inventiveness. The Platonic dialogues show how discussions can lead to aporias and to insights that are not quite what was intended in the argumentation. Hermeneutics, for Heidegger, had exactly this function. Indeed, Husserl's own position was that phenomenology came through insight and attention to what is *given* and gained by insight, rather than through argumentation and deduction. In a sense, the encounters between analytic philosophy and phenomenology have constantly returned to this battleground originally staked out by the neo-Kantians: the relation between sensuous intuition and conceptualization (which itself requires language).

This tension between what can be intuited and what must be deduced continues in the latest versions of the debate. For example, influential commentators, including Hubert L. Dreyfus, have interpreted Searle himself as pursuing a kind of phenomenology with his close description of the essential conditions of intentionality and his interest in consciousness, perception, and other themes familiar to phenomenology. In reaction, Searle has attempted to distinguish his practice of (what he terms) *logical analysis* from what he takes to be *phenomenological analysis*.[100] This distinction largely repeats the kinds of distinction of approach made by Schlick against Husserl, Ryle against Husserl, Carnap against Heidegger, and so on. Yet, it would be wrong to think that the encounters are simply indications of incorrigible misunderstandings and misconnections. Phenomenology continues to develop and mutate and analytic philosophy has discovered that it is not just a method but a tradition that has its own hermeneutical dimensions. Indeed, there is little agreement today as to what constitutes the core of analytic philosophy, and there are challenges to the whole idea of philosophy as *a priori* analysis of intuition. One positive gain is that many analytic philosophers have recognized that phenomenology does have some

100. See especially, John Searle, "The Phenomenological Illusion"; "The Limits of Phenomenology," in *Essays in Honor of Hubert Dreyfus, Volume 2: Heidegger, Coping, and Cognitive Science*, Mark A. Wrathall (ed.) (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000); and "Neither Phenomenological Description Nor Rational Reconstruction: Reply to Hubert Dreyfus," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 55(217) (2001).

value. Searle, for instance, is critical of phenomenology, and yet, in a certain sense, has written approvingly of what phenomenology tries to do: "I want to emphasize at the start that if phenomenology is defined as the examination of the structure of consciousness, I have no objections whatever to phenomenology. My misgivings are about some specific authors and their practice of this method."[101] Searle goes on to say. and perhaps we should leave this as a suitable last word for this essay: "Properly understood, there is no conflict between analytic philosophy and phenomenology. They offer noncompeting and complementary methods of investigation and anybody prepared to do serious work should be ready to use both."[102]

101. Searle, "The Phenomenological Illusion," 317.
102. *Ibid.*, 323.

CHRONOLOGY

	PHILOSOPHICAL EVENTS	CULTURAL EVENTS	POLITICAL EVENTS
1620	Bacon, *Novum organum*		
1633		Condemnation of Galileo	
1634		Establishment of the Academie Française	
1637	Descartes, *Discourse on Method*		
1641	Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*		
1642		Rembrandt, *Nightwatch*	English Civil War begins
1651	Hobbes, *Leviathan*		
1662	*Logique du Port-Royal*		
1665		Newton discovers calculus	
1667		Milton, *Paradise Lost*	
1670	Pascal, *Les Pensées* (posthumous)		
	Spinoza, *Tractatus theologico-politicus*		
1675		Leibniz discovers calculus	
1677	Spinoza, *Ethics*		
1687		Newton, *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica*	
1689	Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration*		
	(–1690) Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*		