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concept of existence. Kant’s explanation of the concept in question made no progress, not because the psychology of his time was not exact and empirical enough, but because it was not founded in an adequately a priori manner—because the ontology of the human Dasein was lacking. Psychology can in no way remedy the defect—which has yet to be discussed more precisely—of the Kantian interpretation of existence as perception and position, because it itself is in need of aid. Making anthropology, in the sense of psychology as a positive science, the foundation of philosophy—for example, of logic—is basically even more absurd than wishing to attempt to establish geometry with the aid of the chemistry and physics of corporeal things. Whatever the stage of development of this science of anthropological psychology, we can expect no help from it for the elucidation of a philosophical problem. It is hardly necessary to observe that what has been said about psychology cannot mean that it is not a science. On the contrary, the fundamental determination of the scientific character of psychology as being a positive, or non-philosophical, science speaks not against psychology but rather in its favor, with the aim of extricating it from its current confusion.

When Kant interprets existence or extantness as perception, this phenomenon “perception” cannot itself be made clear by means of psychology. Psychology, rather, must already know what perception in general is, if it does not wish to grope about blindly in its investigation of perception in its factual processes and genesis.

b) The ontological constitution of perception. Intentionality and transcendence

From what Kant leaves unexplained in the phenomena “perception” and “position” and allows to become blurred in the ambiguity indicated, we shall now attempt to infer which investigation of which interrelationships is provisionally required in order to provide a solid basis, a clear horizon, and assured access for the task of an interpretation of existence, extantness, actuality, being in general.

Kant’s thesis that being is not a real predicate cannot be impugned in its negative content. By it Kant basically wants to say that being is not a being. In contrast, Kant’s positive interpretation—existence as absolute position (perception), being as position in general—turned out to be unclear as well as ambiguous and at the same time questionable when suitably formulated. We now ask, What does Kant really leave undetermined when he uses perception, position with the ambiguity mentioned? What remains obscured when perceiving, the perceived, and the perceivedness of the perceived are not distinguished but nevertheless taken as belonging homog-
eneously to perception? Nothing less than the constitution of the being of perception in general, that is, its ontological nature, and similarly the constitution of the being of position. The ambiguous or the unclear use of the terms “perception” and “position” in Kant is the index of the fact that he leaves altogether undetermined the ontological nature of position and perception. This implies further that in the end the comportments of the ego, of the Dasein in our terminology, are ontologically undefined. The proper explicit ontology of the Dasein, of the being that we ourselves are, is in a bad way. But not only that; it also is not recognized that adequate treatment of the ontology of the Dasein is the presupposition for posing the problem whose solution Kant takes as his task in elucidating the concept of being.

At the outset here we shall not go into the fundamental concept of an ontology of the Dasein. This concept will occupy us in the second and third parts of the course. We shall refrain also from discussing its function as a foundation for philosophical inquiry in general; and still less is it possible to carry out and give an exposition of the ontology of the Dasein even in its main features. I have already offered an attempt at this in the first part of my recently published treatise Being and Time. Conversely, by continuing our analysis of the Kantian problem and the Kantian solution, we shall now try to make our way toward the sphere of the ontology of the Dasein as the foundation of ontology in general.

Kant interprets existence—we now say, in our terminology, extantness, because we reserve for the human being the term [ordinarily used by Kant for existence] “Dasein”—as perception. The threefold meaning, perceiving, perceived, perceivedness of the perceived, is to be kept in mind. But have we gained anything for the elucidation of the existence concept by taking explicit notice of the ambiguity of the expression “perception” and retaining the different meanings? Have we advanced any further in understanding the phenomenon intended by this expression when we differentiate the three meanings of the word “perception”? You surely do not gain any knowledge of a thing by enumerating what a word can mean in its ambiguity. Of course not. But these differences of meaning of the term “perception” have their ground ultimately in the thing signified by them, in the phenomenon of perception itself. Not only the differences of meaning as explicitly conscious, but also precisely the imprecise usage of the ambiguous word goes back perhaps to the peculiarity of the thing signified. Maybe this ambiguity of the expression “perception” is not accidental but bears witness exactly that the phenomenon intended by it already of itself gives to common experience and understanding the basis for interpreting it sometimes as perceiving, perceptual comportment, sometimes as the perceived in the sense of that to which perceptual comportment relates, sometimes as perceivedness in the sense of the being-perceived of what is perceived in
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perceptual comportment. It could thus indeed be that the phenomenon meant by perception provides the basis and support for the ambiguity because it is not simple but ambiguous in its own peculiar structure. Possibly what is intended, which is separated in each case into the three meanings, belongs originally to the unitary structure of what we have to understand as perception. Perhaps this unitary structure is viewed in different respects in the individual meanings and in the apprehension which they guide of the thing denoted.

This is in fact the case. What we concisely call perception is, more explicitly formulated, the perceptual directing of oneself toward what is perceived, in such a way indeed that the perceived is itself always understood as perceived in its perceivedness. This statement does not seem to express an exceptional piece of wisdom. Perception is perceiving, to which there belongs something perceived in its perceivedness. Is this not an empty tautology? A table is a table. The statement, although provisional, is more than a tautology. In it we are saying that perception and perceived belong together in the latter's perceivedness. In speaking of perceptual directedness-toward or of directing-oneself-toward we are saying that the belonging together of the three moments of perception is in each case a character of this directedness-toward. This directedness-toward constitutes, as it were, the framework of the whole phenomenon "perception."

But that perceiving directs itself toward a perceived or, speaking formally and generally, relates itself to it, is surely too self-evident for such a thing to need to receive special notice. Kant indeed says the same thing when he talks about the thing, the perceived, entering into relation with the cognitive faculty, with perceiving, when he talks about a subjective synthesis. Moreover, this expressly noticed relation of perceiving to the perceived also belongs to other modes of comportment: to mere representing, which relates to the represented, to thinking, which thinks the thought, to judgment, which determines something judged, to love, which relates to a beloved. These, one might think, are unsurpassable trivialities which one ought to shrink from pronouncing. Nevertheless, we shall not deny ourselves the explicit formulation of this discovery. Comportments relate to something: they are directed toward this whereto; or, in formal terms, they are related or referred to it. But what are we to make of this statement of the relation of the comportments to that to which they comport? Is this still philosophy at all? Whether it is or is not philosophy we may leave undecided. We may even admit that it is not or is not yet philosophy. Also, we are not really concerned as to what we are to make of the identification of the alleged trivialities, whether with them we shall or shall not be penetrating into the mysteries of the world and of the Dasein. The only thing we care about here is that this trivial identification and what is
intended in it should not escape us—that we should perhaps bring it closer
to us. Perhaps then the alleged triviality will turn into a total enigma.
Perhaps this insignificance will become one of the most exciting problems
for him who can philosophize, who has come to understand that what is
taken for granted as being self-evident is the true and sole theme of
philosophy.

Comportments have the structure of directing-oneself-toward, of being-
directed-toward. Annexing a term from Scholasticism, phenomenology
calls this structure \textit{intentionality}. Scholasticism speaks of the intentio of the
will, of voluntas; it speaks of intentio only in reference to the will. It is far
from assigning intentio also to the remaining comportments of the subject
or indeed from grasping the sense of this structure at all fundamentally.
Consequently, it is a historical as well as a substantive error to say, as is most
frequently said today, that the doctrine of intentionality is Scholastic. But,
even if it were correct, that would be reason not to reject it but rather only to
ask whether it is intrinsically tenable. Nevertheless, Scholasticism does not
know the doctrine of intentionality. In contrast, to be sure, Franz Brentano
in his \textit{Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt} (1874), under the strong
influence of Scholasticism, and especially of Thomas and Suarez, gave
sharper emphasis to intentionality and said that the sum total of all psychi-
cal experiences could and had to be classified with regard to this structure,
the manner of directing oneself toward something. The title “Psychology
from an Empirical Standpoint” means something quite different from the
contemporary expression “empirical psychology.” Brentano influenced
Husserl, who for the first time elucidated the nature of intentionality in the
\textit{Logical Investigations} and carried this clarification further in the \textit{Ideas}.
Nevertheless, it must be said that this enigmatic phenomenon of intention-
ality is far from having been adequately comprehended philosophically.
Our inquiry will concentrate precisely on seeing this phenomenon more
clearly.

If we recall what we ourselves said about perception, the concept of
intentionality can, to begin with, be made clear as follows. Every comport-
ment is a comporting-toward; perception is a perceiving-of. We call this
comporting-toward in the narrower sense the intendere or intentio. Every
comporting-toward and every being-directed-toward has its specific \textit{whereto}
of the comporting and \textit{toward-which} of the directedness. This whereto of
comportment and toward-which of directedness belonging to the intentio
we call the intentum. Intentionality comprises both moments, the \textit{intentio}
and the \textit{intentum}, within its unity, thus far still obscure. The two moments
are different in each comportment; diversity of intentio or of intentum
constitutes precisely the diversity of the modes of comportment. They
differ each in regard to its own peculiar intentionality.
The task is now to pursue this structure of Dasein’s comportments with particular regard to perception and to ask how this structure of intentionality itself looks, but above all how it is grounded ontologically in the basic constitution of the Dasein. To begin with, intentionality as a structure of the Dasein’s comportments must be brought still closer to us; it has to be preserved from natural and constantly importunate misinterpretations. We are thinking here not so much of the misinterpretations contemporary philosophy heaps upon intentionality, all of which arise from preconceived epistemological or metaphysical standpoints. We leave aside specific theories of knowledge, specific philosophical theories in general. We must make the attempt to see the phenomenon of intentionality straightforwardly and without bias. However, even if we avoid the prejudgments that spring from philosophical theories, we are not yet thereby immune to all misinterpretations. On the contrary, the most dangerous and stubborn prejudices relative to the understanding of intentionality are not the explicit ones in the form of philosophical theories but the implicit ones that arise from the natural apprehension and interpretation of things by the Dasein’s everyday “good sense.” These latter misinterpretations are exactly the ones that are least noticeable and hardest to repulse. We shall not now ask wherein these popular prejudices have their ground or to what extent they possess their own right within the everyday Dasein. We shall first attempt to characterize one misinterpretation of intentionality that is based exactly in the naive, natural vision of things. Here we shall orient ourselves again in connection with the intentional character of perception.

"Perception has an intentional character" means first of all that perceiving, its intentio, relates to the perceived, intentum. I perceive the window over there. Let us talk briefly about the relation of the perception to the object. How is this relation to be characterized naturally? The object of perception is the window over there. The relation of the perception of the window manifestly expresses the relation in which the window, extant over there, stands to me as the human being, the subject, extant here. By this presently existent perception of the window there is accordingly created an extant relation between two beings, the extant object and the extant subject. The relation of perception is an extant relation between two extant entities. If I remove one of the members of this relation, say the subject, then the relation itself is also no longer extant. If I let the other member of the relation, the object, the extant window, vanish or if I think it as vanished for me, then also the relation between me and the extant object, and indeed the whole possibility of relation, vanishes with it. For the relation now has, as it were, no further point of support in the extant object. The intentional relation can, it appears, be extant as a relation only if both the relational members are extant, and the relation subsists only so long as these relational
members are themselves extant. Put in another way, in order that a possible relation should subsist between the psychical subject and something else, that subject needs the extantness of a physical object. If there were no physical things, then the psychological subject, without this intentional relation, would have to be extant for itself in an isolated way. The intentional relation belongs to the subject by virtue of the object’s being extant and conversely. All of this seems obvious.

Nevertheless, in this characterization of intentionality as an extant relation between two things extant, a psychical subject and a physical object, the nature as well as the mode of being of intentionality is completely missed. The mistake lies in the fact that this interpretation takes the intentional relation to be something that at each time accrues to the subject due to the emergence of the extantness of an object. Implied in this is the notion that in itself, as an isolated psychical subject, this subject is without intentionality. In contrast, it is necessary to see that the intentional relation does not first arise through the addition of an object to a subject as, say, something like a distance between two extant bodies first arises and is extant only when a second such body is added to a first. The intentional relation to the object does not first fall to the subject with and by means of the extantness of the object; rather, the subject is structured intentionally within itself. As subject it is directed toward. . . . Suppose that someone is seized by a hallucination. In hallucinating he sees here and now in this room that some elephants are moving around. He perceives these objects even though they are not extant. He perceives them; he is directed perceptually toward them. We have here a directedness toward objects without their being extant. As we others say, they are given for him as extant merely in an imaginary way. But these objects can be given to the hallucinator in a merely imaginary way only because his perceiving in the manner of hallucination as such is of such a nature that in this perceiving something can be encountered—because perceiving is intrinsically a comporting-toward, a relationship to the object, whether that object is extant actually or only in imagination. Only because the hallucinative perceiving has within itself qua perception the character of being-directed-toward can the hallucinator intend something in an imaginary way. I can apprehend something imaginarily only if, as apprehender, I intend in general. Only then can intending assume the modification of imaginariness. The intentional relation does not arise first through the actual extantness of objects but lies in the perceiving itself, whether illusionless or illusory. Perceiving must be the perception-of something in order for me to be able to be deceived about something.

It thus becomes clear that what is said about the relation of perceiving to an object is ambiguous. It can mean that perceiving, as something psychical
in the extant subject, stands in a relation with an extant object, the relation being extant because of these two extant entities. This relation stands and falls accordingly with the extantness of the members of the relation. Or the expression “relation of perception to an object” means that the perceiving is intrinsically, in its own structure, constituted by this relation, whether that to which it comports as object is or is not extant. This second sense in which we might speak about the relation of perception to an object is the one more pertinent to the peculiar nature of intentionality. The expression “relation of perception” means, not a relation into which perception first enters as one of the relata and which falls to perception as in itself free of relation, but rather a relation which perceiving itself is, as such. This relation, which we signify by intentionality, is the a priori comportmental character of what we call self-comporting.

As structure of comportments, intentionality is itself a structure of the self-comporting subject. It is intrinsic to the manner of being of the self-comporting subject as the comportmental character of this comportmental relationship. It belongs to the essential nature of comportments, so that to speak of intentional comportment is already a pleonasm and is somewhat equivalent to my speaking of a spatial triangle. Conversely, as long as intentionality is not seen as such, comportments are thought in a confused way, as when I merely represent to myself a triangle without the corresponding idea of space, which is basic to it and makes it possible.

We have thus warded off a misinterpretation of intentionality familiarly present in common sense, but at the same time we have suggested a new misinterpretation to which non-phenomenological philosophy almost universally falls victim. We shall also discuss this second misinterpretation without entering more deeply into specific theories.

The result of the foregoing clarification was that intentionality is not an objective, extant relation between two things extant but, as the comportmental character of comporting, a determination of the subject. The comportments are those of the ego. They are also commonly called the subject’s experiences. Experiences are intentional and accordingly belong to the ego, or, in erudite language, they are immanent to the subject, they belong to the subjective sphere. But, according to a universal methodological conviction of modern philosophy since Descartes, the subject and its experiences are just that which is given for the subject, the ego itself, as above all solely and indubitably certain. The question arises, How can this ego with its intentional experiences get outside its sphere of experience and assume a relation to the extant world? How can the ego transcend its own sphere and the intentional experiences enclosed within it, and what does this transcendence consist in? More precisely we have to ask, What does the intentional
structure of experiences contribute to the philosophical elucidation of trans­
scendence? For intentionality designates a relation of the subject to the
object. But we have heard that intentionality is a structure of experiences
and thus belongs to the subjective sphere. Thus intentional directing-one­
self-toward seems also to remain within the subject’s sphere and, taken for
itself, it seems to provide no help in elucidating transcendence. How do we
proceed from inside the intentional experiences in the subject outward to
things as objects? In themselves, it is said, intentional experiences as
belonging to the subjective sphere relate only to what is immanent within
this sphere. Perceptions as psychical direct themselves toward sensations,
representational images, memory residues, and determinations which the
thinking that is likewise immanent to the subject adds to what is first given
subjectively. Thus the problem that is above all alleged to be the central
philosophical problem must be posed: How do experiences and that to
which they direct themselves as intentional, the subjective in sensations,
representations, relate to the objective?

This way of putting the question seems plausible and necessary; after all,
we ourselves said that experiences, which are supposed to have the charac­
ter of intentionality, belong to the subjective sphere. The succeeding ques­
tion seems inevitable: How do intentional experiences, belonging as they do
to the subjective sphere, relate to transcendent objects? But however plaus­
ible this manner of questioning may seem and however widespread it may
be even within phenomenology itself and the most closely associated
tendencies of recent epistemological realism, as for instance the view of
Nicolai Hartmann, this interpretation of intentionality misses out on that
phenomenon. It fails because for it theory comes first, before fulfilling the
requirement to open our eyes and take the phenomena as they offer
themselves as against all firmly rooted theory and even despite it, that is, the
requirement to align theory according to the phenomena rather than the
opposite, to do violence to the phenomena by a preconceived theory.

What is the central source of this second misinterpretation of intention­
ality that now has to be clarified? This time it does not lie in the character of
the intentio, as with the first misinterpretation, but in that of the intentum,
that toward which the comportment—in our case perception—directs
itself. Intentionality is said to be a character of experiences. Experiences
belong to the subject’s sphere. What is more natural and more logical than
to infer that, consequently, that toward which immanent experiences are
directed must itself be subjective? But however natural and logical this
inference may seem and however critical and cautious this characterization
of intentional experiences and of that toward which they direct themselves
may be, it is after all a theory, in which we close our eyes to the phenomena
and do not give an account of them themselves.
Let us take a natural perception without any theory, without any preconceived opinion about the relationship of subject to object and other such matters, and let us interrogate this concrete perception in which we live, say, the perception of the window. Toward what does it direct itself in correspondence with the peculiar sense of direction of its intentio? Toward what is the perceiving directed in conformity with the peculiar perceptual sense by which it is guided? In everyday behavior, say, in moving around in this room, taking a look around my environment, I perceive the wall and the window. To what am I directed in this perception? To sensations? Or, when I avoid what is perceived, am I turning aside from representational images and taking care not to fall out of these representational images and sensations into the courtyard of the university building?

To say that I am in the first place oriented toward sensations is all just pure theory. In conformity with its sense of direction, perception is directed toward the extant being itself. It intends this precisely as extant and knows nothing at all about sensations that it is apprehending. This holds also when I am involved in a perceptual illusion. If in the dark I mistake a tree for a man, it would be wrong to say that this perception is directed toward a tree but takes it to be a man, that the human being is a mere representation and, consequently, in this illusion I am directed toward a representation. On the contrary, the sense of the illusion is precisely that in taking the tree for a man I am apprehending what I perceive and what I believe I am perceiving as something extant. In this perceptual illusion the man himself is given to me and not, say, a representation of the man.

That toward which perception is directed in conformity with its sense is the perceived itself. It is this that is intended. What is implied in an exposition of this kind, not deluded by any theories? Nothing less than that the question as to how subjective intentional experiences can on their part relate to something objectively present is put completely the wrong way. I cannot and must not ask how the inner intentional experience arrives at an outside. I cannot and must not put the question in that way because intentional comportment itself as such orients itself toward the extant. I do not first need to ask how the immanent intentional experience acquires transcendent validity; rather, what has to be seen is that it is precisely intentionality and nothing else in which transcendence consists. This does not yet provide an adequate elucidation of intentionality and transcendence, but it does provide the way of putting the question that corresponds to the peculiar inherent content of what is being examined, because it is derived from the thing itself. The usual conception of intentionality misunderstands that toward which—in the case of perception—the perceiving directs itself. Accordingly, it also misconstrues the structure of the self-directedness-toward, the intentio. This misinterpretation lies in an erroneous subjectiviz-
ing of intentionality. An ego or subject is supposed, to whose so-called sphere intentional experiences are then supposed to belong. The ego here is something with a sphere in which its intentional experiences are, as it were, encapsulated. But, now, we have seen that the transcending is constituted by the intentional comportments themselves. It follows from this that intentionality must not be misinterpreted on the basis of an arbitrary concept of the subject and ego and subjective sphere and thus taken for an absurd problem of transcendence; rather, just the reverse, the subject is first of all determined in its essential nature only on the basis of an unbiased view of the character of intentionality and its transcendence. Because the usual separation between a subject with its immanent sphere and an object with its transcendent sphere—because, in general, the distinction between an inner and an outer is constructive and continually gives occasion for further constructions, we shall in the future no longer speak of a subject, of a subjective sphere, but shall understand the being to whom intentional comportments belong as Dasein, and indeed in such a way that it is precisely with the aid of intentional comportment, properly understood, that we attempt to characterize suitably the being of the Dasein, one of the Dasein's basic constitutions. The statement that the comportments of the Dasein are intentional means that the mode of being of our own self, the Dasein, is essentially such that this being, so far as it is, is always already dwelling with the extant. The idea of a subject which has intentional experiences merely inside its own sphere and is not yet outside it but encapsulated within itself is an absurdity which misconstrues the basic ontological structure of the being that we ourselves are. When, as earlier remarked, we give the concise name "existence" to the Dasein's mode of being, this is to say that the Dasein exists and is not extant like a thing. A distinguishing feature between the existent and the extant is found precisely in intentionality. "The Dasein exists" means, among other things, that the Dasein is in such a way that in being it comports toward what is extant but not toward it as toward something subjective. A window, a chair, in general anything extant in the broadest sense, does not exist, because it cannot comport toward extant entities in the manner of intentional self-directedness toward them. An extant being is simply one among others also extant.

With this we have made only a first approach toward preserving the phenomenon of intentionality from the crudest of misinterpretations, bringing it to view as yet only approximately. This is the presupposition for expressly making intentionality into a problem, as we shall try to do in the second part of the course.

With the aim of clarifying fundamentally the phenomenon of perception we have first warded off two natural and stubborn misinterpretations of
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intentionality. We may briefly summarize the two faulty interpretations. First, against the erroneous objectivizing of intentionality, it must be said that intentionality is not an extant relation between an extant subject and object but a structure that constitutes the compartmental character of the Dasein’s behavior as such. Secondly, in opposition to the erroneous subjectivizing of intentionality, we must hold that the intentional structure of comportments is not something which is immanent to the so-called subject and which would first of all be in need of transcendence; rather, the intentional constitution of the Dasein’s comportments is precisely the ontological condition of the possibility of every and any transcendence. Transcendence, transcending, belongs to the essential nature of the being that exists (on the basis of transcendence) as intentional, that is, exists in the manner of dwelling among the extant. Intentionality is the ratio cognoscendi of transcendence. Transcendence is the ratio essendi of intentionality in its diverse modes.

It follows from these two determinations that intentionality is neither objective, extant like an object, nor subjective in the sense of something that occurs within a so-called subject, where this subject’s mode of being remains completely undetermined. Intentionality is neither objective nor subjective in the usual sense, although it is certainly both, but in a much more original sense, since intentionality, as belonging to the Dasein’s existence, makes it possible that this being, the Dasein, comports existingly toward the extant. With an adequate interpretation of intentionality, the traditional concept of the subject and of subjectivity becomes questionable. Not only does what psychology means by the subject become questionable but also what psychology itself as a positive science must presuppose implicitly about the idea and constitution of the subject and what philosophy itself has hitherto defined ontologically in an utterly deficient way and left in the dark. The traditional philosophical concept of the subject has also been inadequately determined with regard to the basic constitution of intentionality. We cannot decide anything about intentionality starting from a concept of the subject because intentionality is the essential though not the most original structure of the subject itself.

In view of the misinterpretations mentioned, it is not self-evident what is meant by the trivial statement that perception relates to something perceived. If today under the influence of phenomenology there is much talk about intentionality, whether by that name or another, this does not yet prove that the phenomenon thus designated has been seen phenomenologically. That the comportments of representing, judging, thinking, and willing are intentionally structured is not a proposition that can be noted and known so that, say, inferences can be made from it; rather, it is a directive to
bring to mind what is meant by it, namely, the structure of comportments, and, by turning to the phenomena, to assure ourselves ever anew of the legitimacy of this assertion.

The misinterpretations are not accidental. They are not even exclusively and primarily grounded in a superficiality of thought and of philosophical argument. They have their ground instead in the natural conception of things itself, as they are present in the Dasein in conformity with its nature. The Dasein has this natural tendency to start by taking every being—whether something extant in the sense of a natural thing or something with the mode of being of the subject—as an extant entity and to understand it in the sense of being extant. This is the basic tendency of ancient ontology and one that has not yet been overcome down to the present day because it belongs with the Dasein's understanding of being and its mode of understanding being. Since, in this taking everything given to be something extant, intentionality is not discoverable as a relation among extant things, it must apparently be referred to the subject: if it is not objective then it is something subjective. The subject, again, is taken with the same ontological indeterminateness to be something extant; this is manifest, for instance, in Descartes' cogito sum. Thus intentionality—whether it is conceived objectively or subjectively—remains something that is in some way extant. On the contrary, precisely with the aid of intentionality and its peculiarity of being neither objective nor subjective, we should stop short and ask: Must not the being to which this phenomenon, neither objective nor subjective, obviously belongs be conceived differently than it thus far has been?

When Kant talks about a relation of the thing to the cognitive faculty, it now turns out that this way of speaking and the kind of inquiry that arises from it are full of confusion. The thing does not relate to a cognitive faculty interior to the subject; instead, the cognitive faculty itself and with it this subject are structured intentionally in their ontological constitution. The cognitive faculty is not the terminal member of the relation between an external thing and the internal subject; rather, its essence is the relating itself, and indeed in such a way that the intentional Dasein which thus relates itself as an existent is always already immediately dwelling among things. For the Dasein there is no outside, for which reason it is also absurd to talk about an inside.

If we modify Kant's ambiguous language about perception and attempt to secure independent standing for perception by distinguishing the perceptual intention and the perceived, then we are not simply correcting verbal meanings and terminologies but going back to the ontological nature of what is meant by perception. Because perception has intentional structure, not only can the ambiguity mentioned arise but it must necessarily arise with the failure to see this. Wherever he deals with perception Kant himself has
to make use of its intentional structure under duress from the things themselves, without expressly recognizing it as such. In one place he speaks of perception as reaching somewhere and says that something actual, extant, can be encountered there where it reaches to. But perception can have a reach only if, in conformity with its own nature, it reaches in some way, stretches out-toward, that is, directs-itself-toward. By their essential nature, representations relate to something represented; they point toward or refer to it, but not in such a way that this referential structure would first have to be procured for them; rather, they have it from the start as re-presentations. Whether they give correctly what they claim to be giving is another question; but it would be meaningless to discuss this question if the nature of the claim remained in the dark.

c) Intentionality and understanding of being.

Uncoveredness (perceivedness) of beings and disclosedness of being

We shall keep the direction of Kant's interpretation of actuality, extantness, and characterize more clearly and suitably only the horizon from and in which he carries out the elucidation. What have we gained so far with our preliminary elucidation of the intentional structure of perception? We shall be returning to the structure of position in general when discussing the fourth thesis. We concede to Kant that he does not wish to equate extantness with perceiving, the intentio, and certainly not with the perceived, the intentum, even though he does not himself introduce this distinction. Consequently, the only possibility remaining is to interpret Kant's equation of actuality with perception in the sense that perception here means perceivedness. To be sure, it turned out to be open to question whether the actuality of something actual (the extantness of something extant) may be identified with its perceivedness. On the other hand, however, we reflected that in the perceivedness (being perceived) of the perceived, and thus of the uncovered actual, its actuality must manifestly be unveiled along with it and in a certain sense the extantness of a perceived extant entity must lie enclosed within its perceivedness—that it must be possible to press ahead in some way toward the extantness of the extant by means of the analysis of the perceivedness of the perceived. This implies, however, that perceivedness is not to be equated with extantness but that it is only a necessary though indeed not a sufficient condition of access to extantness. This

2. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, B273. [This is the same passage that is referred to in n. 9 of §8 above and is quoted on p. 46.]
interconnection renders it necessary to attempt a characterization of perceivedness as such.

We therefore ask what the relationship of this character of the perceivedness of something perceived is to what we have been saying hitherto about intentional constitution in general. Perceivedness is of the perceived. How does it belong to it? Can we advance toward the sense of the actuality of something actual by means of the analysis of its perceivedness? Looking to the intentionality of perception, we must say that the perceivedness that belongs to something perceived plainly falls within the intentum, within that toward which the perception is directed. We must first of all pursue further what the intentum of perception is. We have already said that implicit in the intentional directional sense of perceiving there is an intending of the perceived as extant in itself. The intentional directional sense of the perceiving, whether or not it is illusory, itself aims at the extant as extant. In perceiving, I am directed toward the window there as this particular functional thing. This being, this extant entity in the broadest sense, is involved in a particular functionality [Bewandtnis]. It serves to illuminate the room and at the same time to protect it. From its serviceability, from that for which it serves, its characteristic constitution is prescribed—everything that belongs to its determinate reality in the Kantian sense, to its thingness [its Sachheit, what-content, realitas]. We can perceptually describe this extant entity in the everyday way, naively, making pre-scientific statements, but also statements of positive science, about this object. The window is open, it doesn’t close tightly, it is seated well in the wall; the frame’s color is such and such and it has this or that extension. What we thus find before us in this extant entity is, for one thing, determinations that belong to it as a thing of use or, as we also say, as an instrument, and again, determinations like hardness, weight, extendedness, which belong to the window not qua window but as a pure material thing. We can cover over the instrumental characteristics that in the first instance confront us in our natural commerce with such a thing as a window, constituting its utilitarian character, and consider the window merely as an extant thing. But in both cases, whether we consider and describe the window as a utilitarian thing, an instrument, or as a pure natural thing, we already understand in a certain way what it means to say “instrument” and “thing.” In our natural commerce with the instrument, the tool, the measuring instrument, the vehicular instrument, we understand something like instrumentality, and in confrontation with material things we understand something like thingliness. We are searching, however, for the perceivedness of the perceived. But we do not find it among all these thing-determinations which constitute the instrumental character of the perceived entity or among the determinations which belong to the general thing-character of

something extant. Nevertheless, it surely has this perceivedness. For we surely say that the extant is the perceived. Therefore perceivedness is also not a "real predicate." How does it belong to the extant entity? The extant surely doesn’t undergo any alteration due to my perceiving it. It doesn’t experience any increase or diminution of what it is as this extant thing. It is certainly not damaged and made useless by my perceiving it. On the contrary, implicit in the sense of perceptual apprehension is the aim to uncover what is perceived in such a way that it exhibits itself in and of its own self. Thus perceivedness is nothing objective in the object. But may we then conclude, perhaps, that it is something subjective, belonging not to the perceived, the intentum, but to the perceiving, the intentio?

In the analysis of intentionality we were already puzzled about the legitimacy of this customary distinction between subject and object, subjective and objective. Perceiving, as intentional, falls so little into a subjective sphere that, as soon as we wish to talk about such a sphere, perceiving immediately transcends it. Perceivedness belongs perhaps to the Dasein’s intentional comportment; that is to say, it is not subjective and also it is not objective, even though we must always continue to maintain that the perceived being, the extant entity, is perceived, has the character of perceivedness. This perceivedness is a remarkable and enigmatic structure, belonging in a certain sense to the object, to the perceived, and yet not itself anything objective, and belonging to the Dasein and its intentional existence and yet not itself anything subjective. Time and again it becomes necessary to impress on ourselves the methodological maxims of phenomenology not to flee prematurely from the enigmatic character of phenomena nor to explain it away by the violent coup de main of a wild theory but rather to accentuate the puzzlement. Only in this way does it become palpable and conceptually comprehensible, that is, intelligible and so concrete that the indications for resolving the phenomenon leap out toward us from the enigmatic matter itself. In regard to perceivedness—but also, as will yet appear, correspondingly in regard to other features—the problem arises, How can something belong in a certain way to the extant without itself being something extant, and how, being this, can it belong also to the Dasein without signifying something subjective? We shall not solve this problem at present but simply heighten it, in order to show in Part Two that the explanation of the possibility of such a puzzling phenomenon lies in the nature of time.

One thing is clear. The perceivedness of something extant is not itself extant in this thing but belongs to the Dasein, which does not mean that it belongs to the subject and the subject’s immanent sphere. Perceivedness belongs to perceptual intentional comportment. This makes it possible that the extant should be encountered in its own self. Perceiving uncovers the
extant and lets it be encountered in the manner of a specific uncovering. Perception takes from the extant its coveredness and releases it so that it can show itself in its own self. That is the sense of every natural self-circumspection and every natural self-orientation about something, and indeed because this mode of uncovering is implicit in perceiving, corresponding to its own intentional sense.

Our pointing to the fact that perception refers to a perceived does not adequately delimit it as against mere representation, the mere bringing something to mind. This also refers to something, to a being, in a specific way and, like perception itself, it can even refer to something extant. Thus I can now bring to mind the railway station at Marburg. In doing so I am referring not to a representation and not to anything represented but rather to the railway station as it is actually present there. Nevertheless, in this pure bringing-to-mind, that particular entity is apprehended and given in a different way than in immediate perception. These essential differences of intentionality and intentum are not of interest to us here.

Perceiving is a release of extant things which lets them be encountered. Transcending is an uncovering. The Dasein exists as uncovering. The uncoveredness of the extant is what makes possible its release as something encountered. Perceivedness, that is, the specific release of a being in perceiving, is a mode of uncoveredness in general. Uncoveredness is also the determination of the release of something in production or in judgment about . . . .

What is it that belongs to an uncovering of a being, in our case the perceptual uncovering of an extant entity? The mode of uncovering and the mode of uncoveredness of the extant obviously must be determined by the entity to be uncovered by them and by its way of being. I cannot perceive geometrical relations in the sense of natural sense perception. But how is the mode of uncovering to be, as it were, regulated and prescribed by the entity to be uncovered and its mode of being, unless the entity is itself uncovered beforehand so that the mode of apprehension can direct itself toward it? On the other hand, this uncovering in its turn is supposed to adapt itself to the entity that is to be uncovered. The mode of the possible uncoverability of the extant in perception must already be prescribed in the perceiving itself; that is, the perceptual uncovering of the extant must already understand beforehand something like extantness. In the intentio of the perceiving something like an understanding of extantness must already be antecedently present. Is this solely an a priori requirement that we must impose because otherwise the perceptual uncovering of things would remain unintelligible? Or can it be shown that something like an understanding of extantness is already implicit in the intentionality of perception, that is, in perceptual uncovering? Not only can this be shown but we have already shown it, or, to

speak more cautiously, we have already made use of this understanding of extantness that belongs to the intentionality of perception, but without having yet explicitly characterized this structure.

In the first description of the intentum—that toward which perception directs itself—in opposition to the subjectivistic misinterpretations that perception is directed in the first instance only to something subjective, that is, to sensations, it was necessary to show that perception is directed toward the extant itself. We said then that in order to see this we need only interrogate the tendency of apprehension, or its directional sense, which lies in perception itself. In accord with its directional sense, perceiving intends the extant in its extantness. The extant in its extantness belongs to the directional sense—that is to say, the intentio is directed toward uncovering the extant in its extantness. The intentio itself includes an understanding of extantness, even if it is only pre-conceptual. In this understanding, what extantness means is unveiled, laid open, or, as we say, disclosed. We speak of the disclosedness given in the understanding of extantness. This understanding of extantness is present beforehand as pre-conceptual in the intentio of perceptual uncovering as such. This “beforehand” does not mean that in order to perceive, to uncover something extant, I would first expressly have to make clear to myself the sense of extantness. The antecedent understanding of extantness is not prior in the order of measured clocktime. The precedence of the understanding of extantness belonging to perceptual uncovering means rather the reverse. This understanding of extantness, of actuality in the Kantian sense, is prior in such a way—it belongs in such a way to the nature of perceptual comportment—that I do not at all first have to perform it expressly; rather, as we shall see, it is implicit in the basic constitution of the Dasein itself that, in existing, the Dasein also already understands the mode of being of the extant, to which it comports existingly, regardless of how far this extant entity is uncovered and whether it is or is not adequately and suitably uncovered. Not only do intentio and intentum belong to the intentionality of perception but so also does the understanding of the mode of being of what is intended in the intentum.

Later we shall occupy ourselves with how this precursory pre-conceptual understanding of extantness (actuality) lies in the uncovering of the extant—that what this lying means and how it is possible. What is of concern now is merely to see in general that uncovering comportment toward the extant maintains itself in an understanding of extantness and that the disclosure of extantness belongs to this comportment, to the Dasein’s existence. This is the condition of the possibility of the uncoverability of extant things. Uncoverability, the perceptibility of extant things, presupposes disclosedness of extantness. With respect to its possibility, perceivedness is grounded in the understanding of extantness. Only if we bring the perceivedness of the
perceived back in this way to its foundations, only if we analyze this understanding of extantness itself which belongs essentially to the full intentionality of perception, do we place ourselves in a position to clarify the sense of the extantness thus understood or, in Kantian terms, the sense of existence.

It is manifestly this understanding of being to which Kant recurs without seeing it clearly when he says that existence, actuality, is equivalent to perception. Without already giving the answer to the question how actuality is to be interpreted, we must keep in mind that over against the Kantian interpretation, actuality equals perception, there is presented a wealth of structures and structural moments of that to which Kant basically recurs. In the first place we meet with intentionality. Not only intentio and intentum but with similar originality a mode of uncoveredness of the intentum uncovered in the intentio belong to it. Not only does its uncoveredness—that it is uncovered—belong to the entity which is perceived in perception, but also the being-understood, that is, the disclosedness of that uncovered entity's mode of being. We therefore distinguish not only terminologically but also for reasons of intrinsic content between the uncoveredness of a being and the disclosedness of its being. A being can be uncovered, whether by way of perception or some other mode of access, only if the being of this being is already disclosed—only if I already understand it. Only then can I ask whether it is actual or not and embark on some procedure to establish the actuality of the being. We must now manage to exhibit more precisely the interconnection between the uncoveredness of a being and the disclosedness of its being and to show how the disclosedness (unveiledness) of being founds, that is to say, gives the ground, the foundation, for the possibility of the uncoveredness of the being. In other words, we must manage to conceptualize the distinction between uncoveredness and disclosedness, its possibility and necessity, but likewise also to comprehend the possible unity of the two. This involves at the same time the possibility of formulating the distinction between the being \([\text{Seienden}]\) that is uncovered in the uncoveredness and the being \([\text{Sein}]\) which is disclosed in the disclosedness, thus fixing the differentiation between being and beings, the ontological difference. In pursuing the Kantian problem we arrive at the question of the *ontological difference*. Only on the path of the solution of this basic ontological question can we succeed in not only positively corroborating the Kantian thesis that being is not a real predicate but at the same time positively supplementing it by a radical interpretation of being in general as extantness (actuality, existence).

We now clearly see that the possibility of giving an exposition of the ontological difference is interconnected with the necessity of investigating intentionality, the mode of access to beings, although this does not mean
that the mode of access to each being represents perception in the Kantian sense. Kant does not put the elucidation of actuality, existence, in the center when he equates actuality with perception. He stays at the extreme edge of the problem's field and in such a way that this edge even disappears for him into obscurity. Nevertheless the direction of the path he follows, by returning to the subject in its broadest sense, is the only one that is possible and correct. It is the direction of the interpretation of being, actuality, existence that was followed not just by modern philosophy since Descartes, by expressly orienting its philosophical problems to the subject. Direction toward the subject—or toward what is basically meant by it, namely, our Dasein—is also followed by ontological inquiry in antiquity, that of Plato and Aristotle, which was not yet at all oriented subjectivistically in the modern sense. This, however, does not mean that Plato's and Aristotle's basic philosophical tendency may be interpreted somewhat in Kant's sense, as the Marburg School did some years back. In their effort to elucidate being, the Greeks proceed in the same direction as Kant when they go back to the logos. The logos has the peculiarity of making manifest, either of uncovering or of disclosing something, between which two the Greeks distinguished as little as did modern philosophy. As basic comportment of the psuche, the logos is an aletheuein, a making-manifest, which is peculiar to the psuche in the broadest sense or to the nous—terms that are badly understood if they are thoughtlessly translated as soul and mind and oriented to the corresponding concepts. The psuche, says Plato, discourses with itself about being; it discusses being, otherness, sameness, motion, rest, and the like thoroughly with itself; that is, it already of its own self understands being, actuality, and the like. The logos psuches is the horizon to which every procedure that attempts to elucidate being and actuality and the like betakes itself. All philosophy, in whatever way it may view the "subject" and place it in the center of philosophical investigation, returns to the soul, mind, consciousness, subject, ego in clarifying the basic ontological phenomena. Neither ancient nor medieval ontology is, as the customary ignorance of them takes them to be, a purely objective ontology excluding consciousness; rather, what is peculiar to them is precisely that consciousness and the ego are taken to be in the same way as the objective is taken to be. Evidence for this is provided by the fact that ancient philosophy orients its ontology to the logos and it could be said with a certain propriety that ancient ontology is a logic of being. This is correct to the extent that the logos is the phenomenon that is supposed to clarify what being means. However, the "logic" of being does not mean that ontological problems were reduced to logical problems in the sense of academic logic. Reversion to the ego, to the soul, to consciousness, to mind, and to the Dasein is necessary for specific and inherently pertinent reasons.
We can express the unanimity of this tendency in philosophical interpretations of being and actuality by still another formulation of the problem. Being, actuality, existence belong among the most universal concepts that the ego, as it were, brings with it. These concepts were and are therefore called innate ideas, ideae innatae. They reside in the human Dasein from the very outset. On the basis of its ontological constitution the Dasein brings with it a vision, idein, an understanding, of being, actuality, existence. Leibniz says frequently, even if much more crudely and ambiguously than Kant, that we comprehend what being, substance, identity, duration, alteration, cause, and effect are only in reflection upon our own selves. The doctrine of innate ideas is prevalent more or less plainly throughout the whole of philosophy. Nevertheless, it is more of an evasion and an elimination than a solution of the problem. It is too simple a retreat to a being and a property of that being, innateness, which is itself explained no further. However unclearly innateness is conceived, it should not be understood here in the physiological-biological sense. It should be taken instead to mean that being and existence are understood prior to beings. This does not, however, mean that being, existence, and actuality are what the individual first realizes in his biological development—that children first of all understand what existence is; rather, this ambiguous expression "innateness" refers only to the earlier, the preceding, the a priori, which was identified with the subjective from Descartes to Hegel. The problem of the elucidation of being can be extricated from this blind alley or first properly posed as a problem only if we ask: What does innateness mean? How is it possible on the basis of the Dasein's ontological constitution? How can it be defined? Innateness is not a physiological-biological fact; instead, its sense lies in the indication that being, existence, is earlier than beings. It must be taken in the philosophical-ontological sense. Hence it is also not to be thought that these concepts and principles are innate because all men recognize the validity of these propositions. The agreement of human beings about the validity of the law of contradiction is solely a sign of innateness but not the reason for it. Recourse to universal agreement and assent is not yet a philosophical certification of logical or ontological axioms. In our phenomenological consideration of the second thesis—to each being there belong a what and a way-of-being—we shall see that the same horizon opens up there as well, namely, the attempt to elucidate ontological concepts by recourse to the Dasein of human beings. To be sure, it will also appear that this recourse, precisely with regard to this problem, is not formulated as explicitly in ancient and medieval ontology as it is in Kant. Nevertheless, it is in fact present there.

It has become clear in a number of ways that the critical discussion of the Kantian thesis leads to the necessity of an explicit ontology of the Dasein.
For it is only on the basis of the exposition of the basic ontological constitution of the Dasein that we put ourselves in a position to understand adequately the phenomenon correlated with the idea of being, the understanding of being which lies at the basis of all comportment to beings and guides it. Only if we understand the basic ontological constitution of the Dasein can we make clear to ourselves how an understanding of being is possible in the Dasein. It has, however, also become clear that the ontology of the Dasein represents the latent goal and constant and more or less evident demand of the whole development of Western philosophy. But this can be seen and demonstrated only if this demand is itself expressly put and fulfilled in its basic features. The discussion of the Kantian thesis led in particular to a basic ontological problem, the question of the distinction between being and beings, the problem of the ontological difference. In examining the Kantian thesis we touched upon problems at every step without taking note of them expressly as such. Thus, in order to discuss the Kantian thesis fully, it was necessary not only to analyze the equation of existence, actuality, with absolute position but also correspondingly to analyze the equation of being with position generally; that is, it was necessary to show that position, positing, also has an intentional structure. We shall return to this point in the context of our discussion of the fourth thesis where we deal with being in the sense of the “is” of the copula, which Kant interprets as respectus logicus, that is, as the positing of being in general. Kant understands the being that he takes to be one with position generally as the “is” which is posited as the combining of subject and predicate in the proposition. For its analysis it is requisite that the structure of the positional character of the proposition be exhibited.

The provisional clarification of intentionality led us further to the difference in ontological constitution between the objective entity and the subjective entity, the Dasein, who exists. Plainly this distinction between the being that we ourselves are and the being that we are not—or, expressed in a formally Fichtean manner, between the ego and the non-ego—is not accidental but must somehow impress itself on the common consciousness, and philosophy is interested in it from the very beginning. We shall discuss it in the third thesis, so that the interconnection of the first thesis with the fourth and third already becomes clear.

In explicating the contents of the Kantian thesis we started from the concept of reality, thingness, from which existence was to be distinguished as a non-real character. Nevertheless, we should bear in mind that reality, too, is no more something real than existence is something existent, which is expressed in Kant by the fact that for him reality, like existence, is a category. Reality is an ontological characteristic that belongs to every being, whether it is actual or merely possible, insofar as each being is something, has
a real content, a what-content. It is not enough to exclude existence as something non-real from the real determinations of a thing; it is equally necessary to determine the ontological sense of reality in general and to ask how the connection between reality and existence is to be conceived and how its possibility can be exhibited. This is a problem that lies virtually hidden in the Kantian thesis. It is none other than the content of the second thesis, to the discussion of which we shall now turn. We should keep in mind that the four theses are interconnected among themselves. The real content of any one of these problems includes within itself that of the others. The four theses formulate only externally and still covertly the systematic unity of the basic ontological problems, toward which we are groping by way of the preparatory discussion of the theses.