

Charles University
Faculty of Arts
Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies

Bachelor Thesis

Milan Zeman

Kant, Husserl and Berkeleyan Idealism

Kant, Husserl a Berkeleyovský idealismus

I hereby wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Daniele De Santis for letting me express my ideas freely and openly and helping me give them as clear an expression as possible.

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

I declare that the following BA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned and that this thesis has not been used in the course of other university studies or in order to acquire the same or another type of diploma.

Abstract

Both Kant as well as Husserl have, at the mature stage of their thought, arrived at and strongly advocated specific idealistic doctrines which bear a great resemblance and even the same name, namely *transcendental idealism*. Although, in reality, the two doctrines are substantially different, there is one point in which they entirely overlap: they were both being anxiously differentiated by their authors from the *material idealism* of Berkeley, that is, the controversial 18th century doctrine which denies the mind-independent existence of the material world. The objective of this thesis is to demonstrate that, despite their adamant claims to the contrary, both Kant as well as Husserl are, as regards their idealistic doctrines, unequivocally Berkeleyan or, in other words, material idealists, and that the arguments they present in defense against this interpretation are either untenable or irrelevant with regard to the ontological orientation of their idealism. In both cases, the demonstration of the positive thesis is based on the very core of the given form of idealism: thus, we shall see that, in the case of Kant, material idealism is fully contained within the doctrine of the transcendental aesthetic, and that, in the case of Husserl, the same applies to his principle of relativity.

Keywords

Kant, Husserl, Berkeley, material idealism, Berkeleyan idealism, transcendental idealism, phenomenological idealism

Abstrakt

Jak Kant, tak Husserl se ve zralé fázi svého myšlení dopracovali k určitým idealistickým naukám, které si jsou vzájemně velmi podobné a dokonce i nesou stejné jméno, totiž *transcendentální idealismus*. Ačkoliv jsou tyto dvě stejnojmenné nauky ve skutečnosti podstatně odlišné, v jednom bodě se zcela překrývají: obě totiž byly jejich autory úzkostlivě odlišovány od Berkeleyho *materiálního idealismu*, to jest, od oné kontroverzní nauky z 18. století, která popírá na mysli nezávislou existenci materiálního světa. Cílem této práce je ukázat, že Kant a Husserl jsou, navzdory jejich neoblomnému nesouhlasu, jednoznačně Berkeleyovskými či, jinými slovy, materiálními idealisty, a že argumenty, jimiž se vůči tomuto výkladu hájí, jsou buď neudržitelné, anebo irelevantní vzhledem k otázce ontologické orientace jejich idealismu. Argumentace pro pozitivní tezi této práce se v obou případech zakládá na samotném jádru té které formy idealismu: v práci je tudíž ukázáno, že v případě Kanta je materiální idealismus celistvě obsažen již v jeho nauce transcendentální estetiky, a že v případě Husserla totéž platí pro jeho princip relativity.

Klíčová slova

Kant, Husserl, Berkeley, materiální idealismus, Berkeleyovský idealismus, transcendentální idealismus, fenomenologický idealismus

Table of Contents

Introduction.....7

First Part: Kant.....9

 §1 General Introduction.....9

 §2 Kant’s Idealism, or The Doctrine of the Transcendental Aesthetic.....11

 §3 Kant and Berkeley: On their Apparent Difference and Concealed Identity.....15

 §4 Kant’s Defense.....19

Second Part: Husserl.....21

 §5 General Introduction.....21

 §6 Husserl’s Idealism.....22

 §7 On the Nature of Husserl’s Idealism.....25

 §8 Husserl’s Defense.....27

 §9 On the Internal Inconsistency of Husserl’s Ontology.....32

Conclusion.....34

Bibliography.....35

 1. Primary sources.....35

 1.1 Philosophy.....35

 1.2 Psychology.....36

 2. Secondary sources.....37

Introduction

In the history of the so-called transcendental philosophy, there are two figures in particular that stand out above others due to the degree of influence that they have had both on their contemporaries as well as on the thinkers of upcoming generations, namely Kant, the originator of the tradition of transcendental philosophy himself, and Husserl, the founder of the famed phenomenological movement. Both of these philosophers have seen it as their life's goal to make of philosophy a strict universal science based on a firm foundation as well as to clearly delimitate its own proper field of inquiry so as to prevent groundless speculative tendencies, as in the case of Kant, or intrusions from the natural sciences, as in the case of Husserl. However, in spite of this general like-mindedness, one ought not to be all too rash in naming these two figures in the same breath, for, at a closer inspection of the actual manner in which they have sought to fulfill these goals and of the doctrines at which they have arrived, it becomes evident that what seems to be a great likeness and affinity on the surface in reality conceals a great difference lurking underneath. Perhaps the most striking case of this sort are the two idealistic doctrines arrived at and strongly advocated by both of these philosophers at the mature stage of their thought, which, in spite of bearing a truly uncanny resemblance with regard to content and even the same name – *transcendental idealism* – are fundamentally different. Nonetheless, it is within the two different idealistic doctrines that one of the few *concrete* points that Kant and Husserl actually do have in common is to be found; for, while the forms of idealism put forth by Kant and Husserl are indeed greatly distinct, there is, nevertheless, a point in which they entirely overlap: they were both being anxiously differentiated by their authors from the *material idealism* of Berkeley, that is, the controversial 18th century doctrine which denies the mind-independent existence of the material world¹.

1 Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* has, much to Kant's great dissatisfaction, been received as nothing but an embellished form of Berkeleyan idealism almost immediately after its publication in 1781, namely in the famous *Göttinger Rezension* written by Feder and Garve, on which see K. Pollok, "Die Göttinger Rezension", in: I. Kant, *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik*, Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 2001. Kant went to great lengths to defend himself against this reproach, as the numerous passages in the *Prolegomena* as well as in the second edition of the first *Critique* attest. – In the case of Husserl, the situation was slightly different. Although Husserl's idealism stirred great controversy among his students, they were not so much disconcerted by the specific kind of idealism that Husserl advocated as by the fact that he even advocated idealism in the first place, which came as a shock after the *Logical Investigations*. As Edith Stein tells us of Husserl's students, after the first volume of Husserl's *Ideas* was published, "Alle hatten dieselbe Frage auf dem Herzen. Die 'Logischen Untersuchungen' hatten vor allem dadurch Eindruck gemacht, daß sie als eine radikale Abkehr vom kritischen Idealismus kantischer und neukantischer Prägung erschienen. [...]"

In this text, we shall attempt to demonstrate that, although both of these philosophers claim most vivaciously and with great conviction that there is a crucial difference² and even direct opposition³ between their forms of idealism and that of Berkeley, they are, in truth, as their doctrines stand, themselves Berkeleyan idealists⁴.

Since the idealistic doctrines of Kant and Husserl are, in truth, substantially different, we shall treat of both philosophers individually and in the case of each one closely investigate the theses of their forms of idealism along with the reasons for which they believe their idealism to be different from Berkeley's. We shall see that their forms of idealism truly amount to nothing else but material idealism and that the main arguments which they use in order to stave off the reproach – be it real or merely hypothetical – of advocating material idealism are, in the final analysis, either untenable or of no relevance with regard to the ontological orientation of their idealistic doctrines.

Die 'Ideen' aber enthielten einige Wendungen, die ganz danach klangen, als wollte ihr Meister zum Idealismus zurücklenken." (E. Stein, *Aus dem Leben einer jüdischen Familie*, Freiburg: Herder, 1965, p. 174). It seems Husserl fought the reproach of Berkeleyan idealism merely in hypothetical terms, his arguments being more of a precaution rather than a defense, as, for instance, in §55 of *Ideas I*. However, that Husserl also felt that his idealism was being misinterpreted in this direction by his readers and students is evident from the following passage in *Formal and Transcendental Logic*: "*Man darf diesen [Berkeley'schen oder Humeschen] Idealismus aber ja nicht verwechseln, wie das von oberflächlichen Lesern meiner Schriften (auch phänomenologischen Lesern) immer wieder geschieht, mit dem von mir ausgebildeten phänomenologischen Idealismus, [...]*" (E. Husserl, *Formale und transzendente Logik*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1974, §66).

2 In a letter to Maximilian Beck from the 28th of October 1928, for instance, Husserl speaks of "*Abgründe*" between his, Berkeley's and other traditional forms of idealism (E. Husserl, *Briefwechsel II*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994, p. 10).

3 This is the case of Kant, as is evident from the appendix to the *Prolegomena*, where he declares his form of idealism to be "*gerade das Gegenteil*" (A 206) of the idealism of Berkeley. However, even Husserl considered his idealism to be, in a certain sense, the opposite or antidote to the Berkeleyan sort of idealism, as is evident from E. Husserl, *Formale und transzendente Logik*, *loc. cit.*

4 Of course, that is not to say that there are no differences between Kant, Husserl and Berkeley, which to claim would be absurd. What we mean by 'Berkeleyan idealism' is simply material idealism, which does not at all entail all aspects of Berkeley's philosophy, but rather only the claim that the material world is dependent on consciousness and ceases to exist without it. In other words, to be a Berkeleyan idealist does not necessarily entail being a "Berkeleyan", as there are more paths than the one pursued by Berkeley leading towards material idealism, a doctrine which is referred to as "Berkeleyan idealism" merely because Berkeley was its first and most famous proponent.

First Part: Kant

§1 General Introduction

With regard to the relation of Kant's idealism to that of Berkeley, the complete opposite of what we have said of Kant and Husserl above applies, for, while there are, in this case, clear and most important differences on the surface, there is, in reality, an identity underneath. The situation is quite complicated. On the one hand, Kant was acutely aware of the necessity of overcoming material idealism and even came up with the sole key toward doing so, namely the idea of *transcendental*, or, which is much more precise, *formal idealism*⁵; on the other hand, the version of formal idealism that Kant established in the *Critique of Pure Reason* and then laid out in the *Prolegomena* in fact turns out to be nothing else but material idealism, namely once its flaws are exposed and the import of its principles brought to full light. In other words, as a consequence of Kant being a *formal idealist*, there are crucial conceptual differences between Kant and Berkeley – such as the notion of the thing-in-itself – which clearly separate them and make it seem as if Kant's idealism truly had nothing to do with Berkeley's or as if it even were its opposite; yet, as a consequence of the problems in Kant's version that we just alluded to, we shall see that these differences are in fact merely formal and do not at all pertain to the actual content of the respective forms of idealism.

While this makes the task of proving our thesis in the case of Kant quite complicated, it also indicates clearly the path towards said goal, for it is now evident that, in order to do so, we have to show nothing else but that the differences between Kant and Berkeley are merely formal, or, in other words, that, despite the formal differences between Kant's and Berkeley's forms of idealism, the two doctrines in reality collide and amount to the same stance. Accordingly, we shall not be discussing any other version of formal idealism whose possibility

5 A designation that Kant himself, at the more mature stage of his first critical decade, came to prefer to the more obscure 'transcendental' idealism, as is evident from the *Prolegomena* (A208). In the second edition of the *Critique*, Kant adds a footnote to the first edition treatment of transcendental idealism in the chapter on the antinomies, where he says: "*Ich habe ihn [den transzendentalen Idealismus] bisweilen den formalen Idealismus genannt, um ihn von dem materialen [...] zu unterscheiden. In manchen Fällen scheint es ratsam zu sein, sich lieber dieser als der obgenannten Ausdrücke zu bedienen, um alle Mißdeutung zu verhüten.*" (I. Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (hereafter *KrV*), Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1998, B520. It seems Kant did not lay much stress on keeping the designation 'transcendental'; in one of his *Reflexiones* (5642), after having summarized the import of his idealistic doctrine, he simply states: "*Ich habe diese Lehre einmal den transszendentalen Idealismus genannt, weil man keinen Nahmen davor hat.*" (I. Kant, *Handschriftlicher Nachlaß V*, AA XVIII, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928, p. 279).

we implied above, nor what exactly the abstracted *idea* of formal idealism itself amounts to; we will merely endeavour to show that Kant's own realization thereof is nothing but a theoretically more complex form of material idealism.

Much has been said about Kant's relation to Berkeley, and, broadly speaking, there are those who tend more toward opposing the identification of their doctrines⁶ and those who tend more toward arguing for it⁷. In this chapter, we do not wish to sift through the *pro et contra* of the individual argumentative strategies, but rather attempt to show that, with regard to the question whether Kant is a Berkeleyan idealist, there is not much space for debate in the first place.⁸ We intend to do so by proving that the very basis of Kant's entire critical project in the first *Critique*, namely the doctrine of the transcendental aesthetic, already in itself fully entails material idealism, for, once it becomes evident that this is the case, it will also become clear that all of Kant's argumentation against the identification of formal idealism with the "dogmatic idealism" of Berkeley is really of no relevance. In other words, we shall see that, insofar as Kant everywhere firmly affirms the doctrine of the transcendental aesthetic – as he indeed does – and insofar as this doctrine in itself already entails the entire stance of material idealism, it makes no difference whatsoever what he claims elsewhere.

In truth, to show (i) that the relevant differences between Kant and Berkeley, that is, those that could provide a basis for arguing a thesis opposite to ours, are in reality merely formal, and (ii) that the doctrine of the transcendental aesthetic itself already fully entails material idealism, is one and the same thing seen from different perspectives. Accordingly, the path towards proving both of these theses will be constituted by one central argument, which will consist in demonstrating that the notion of the thing-in-itself, as it is presented within the

6 For instance, M. D. Wilson, "Kant and the 'Dogmatic Idealism of Berkeley'" (1971), in: *Ideas and Mechanism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014, pp. 276-293; H. E. Allison, *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*, New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2004, I.2; and F. C. Beiser, *German Idealism*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press, 2002, I.5-7.

7 For instance, C. M. Turbayne, "Kant's refutation of Dogmatic Idealism", in: *The Philosophical Quarterly*, No. 20, vol. 5, pp. 225-244, 1955; or, more recently, P. F. Strawson, *The Bounds of Sense*, London: Methuen, 1966.

8 Of course, this largely depends on what one conceives of under the term 'Berkeleyan idealism'. As we have said in the introduction to this paper, we only mean *material idealism* by this phrase, that is, nothing else but denying the mind-independent existence of the material world. Whether the specific manner in which Berkeley and Kant arrive at this point differs – which it undoubtedly does – we deem as irrelevant. Thus, we do not mean to say, for instance, that there is no space for describing the conceptual, superficial differences between Kant and Berkeley, which are, depending on the perspective and level of analysis, more or less numerous; but only that, in the final analysis, Kant is unambiguously a material idealist.

transcendental aesthetic, is nonsensical.

In the following, we shall first discuss Kant's idealism (§2), then endeavour to provide a demonstration of our theses (§3) and, finally, assess the import of Kant's explicit defense against the charge of being a Berkeleyan idealist (§4).

§2 Kant's Idealism, or The Doctrine of the Transcendental Aesthetic

Kant's idealism is, as it seems to us, best conceptualized as a highly original and ingenious answer to a problem which had been prominent in philosophy since the Cartesian revolution in the 17th century, namely the problem of "the ideal and the real", as Schopenhauer precisely named it in his historical sketch of modern philosophy⁹. The problem consisted in the following question: what is it in our experience that is merely *subjective* and as such dependent on the mind, and what is it that, on the contrary, is *objective* and exists independently of the mind?¹⁰

The two most notorious answers to this problem before Kant were those furnished by Locke and Berkeley, the former being a prime representant of what we may call *material realism*, whereas the latter the first proponent of the already much mentioned *material idealism*. In order to make the main claims of Kant's idealism clear, let us contrast it with Locke's material realism, as Locke's position can be seen as a sort of mild precursor to Kant's theses.¹¹

Locke's position rests on the theoretical framework of the early modern version of ancient atomism, namely the corpuscular hypothesis, which maintains that material objects consist of miniature particles, *corpuscula*, which are unperceivable by the naked eye. The key theses of Locke's material realism are to be found in his *Essay*, where he presents the classical articulation of one of the most famous tenets of the atomistic world-view, namely the distinction between primary and secondary qualities. According to this distinction, there are two classes of qualities pertaining to material bodies: "*First, such as are utterly inseparable*

9 A. Schopenhauer, *Parerga und Paralipomena, erster Band*, p. 9, in: *Sämtliche Werke, vierter Band*, ed. P. Deussen, München: R. Piper & Co., 1913.

10 Although the philosophers of the modern times were not posing this question explicitly in their works, it was, due to their newly found interest in the sphere of subjectivity and its relation to the external world, nevertheless implicitly always present therein and became more explicit as time progressed.

11 Kant himself elucidates his idealism in this manner in the *Prolegomena*, §13, Anm. II.

from the body, in what state soever it be; [...] These I call original or primary qualities of body, which I think we may observe to produce simple ideas in us, viz. solidity, extension, figure, motion or rest, and number.”¹² – “Secondly, such qualities which in truth are nothing in the objects themselves but powers to produce various sensations in us by their primary qualities, i.e. by the bulk, figure, texture, and motion of their insensible parts, as colours, sounds, tastes, &c. These I call secondary qualities.”¹³ – Thus, according to the implications of Locke’s theory, only those qualities which he refers to as secondary, such as colour, smell, taste, sound and others, are dependent on the mind, or, more broadly, on the perceiving subject, whereas the qualities he refers to as primary, such as extension or movement, are independent thereof¹⁴. In other words, primary qualities inhere to material things as such regardless of whether they are perceived or not, whereas secondary qualities of a material thing only arise when that thing is perceived. For instance, perception of a specific colour is, in its original form, namely as sensation, nothing but a mosaic of different shades of light of a varying wavelength reflected onto the eye’s retina from the surface of the object in question, which light, essentially a carrier of the relevant ‘information’, first needs to be processed by the nerve endings in the eye and then carried by the optic nerve to the brain, where the neural information is finally evaluated and the final percept constituted.¹⁵ From this, it is evident that without the entire sensory apparatus which takes part in constituting the percept, the percept could never arise. Thus, if we abstract from it, we also have to abstract from all the qualities which it constitutes through processing sensation in the manner just described: and precisely those qualities are the qualities Locke refers to as ‘secondary’. In Locke’s view, then, what we have left when we abstract from the perceiver and all the qualities that are

12 J. Locke, *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975, II.8.9.

13 J. Locke, *ibid.*, II.8.10.

14 As far as we know, Locke himself does not explicitly label secondary qualities dependent on the mind. Nevertheless, it is evident that he was aware of the implication of their mind-dependency contained in his distinction, as, near the end of the second book of his *Essay*, he speaks of the ideas of sight and touch in the following terms: “[...] were there no fit organs to receive the impressions fire makes on the sight and touch, nor a mind joined to those organs to receive the ideas of light and heat by those impressions from the fire or sun, there would yet be no more light or heat in the world than there would be pain if no sensible creature were to feel it, though the sun should continue just as it is now, and Mount Aetna flame higher than ever it did.” (J. Locke, *ibid.*, II.31.2). Immediately after this remark, he adds: “Solidity and extension, and the termination of it, figure, with motion and rest [...] would be really in the world as they are, whether there were any sensible being to perceive them or no.” (J. Locke, *ibid.*).

15 R. Šikl, *Zrakové vnímání*, Praha: Grada Publishing, 2012, p. 21 ff; cf. J. J. Gibson, *The Perception of the Visual World*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1950 pp. 45-51.

dependent on him is pure matter constituted by the *corpuscula* which, as such, is *extended*, has a certain *figure* and is capable of *motion*, or, in other words: matter and its primary qualities. In Kant's terms, matter and its primary qualities are, according to Locke, the thing-in-itself, whereas every other aspect of the material world mere appearance.

Here we can begin the intended contrast, for Kant went much further than Locke and provided an answer way more profound. Kant's contribution does not consist in introducing the dichotomy of appearance and the thing-in-itself, which, albeit not in these exact terms, has been present in philosophy ever since its beginning¹⁶, but rather in the fact that he broadened the meaning of this dichotomy in a groundbreaking way. While Kant retained the fundamental principle that many philosophers dealing with the problem of appearance before Kant, such as the Pyrrhonics or the early modern thinkers, adhered to, namely that through sense perception we do not at all come to perceive qualities which we can attribute to things regardless of their relation to our senses, but only qualities of a *phenomenal* nature, namely qualities which are, with regard to their existence and specific form, dependent on the sensory apparatus, he crucially extended its meaning, for, in the transcendental aesthetic of his *Critique of Pure Reason*, where he is specifically concerned with sensibility in isolation, he introduces a whole new concept thereof. According to Kant, sensibility, or the 'sensory apparatus' is not to be understood merely in physiological terms, namely as the specific organic structure of the sense organs and their correlative neural systems, but rather also as a certain *cognitive structure*, which Kant refers to as "pure form of sensibility" and within which, according to Kant, all data of sensation are necessarily evaluated and organized. This cognitive structure is, as Kant maintains, constituted by the form of the outer sense, or *space*, which enables us to perceive external objects, and the form of the inner sense, or *time*, which enables us to perceive our own internal states. Since space is the form of the outer sense and time the form of the inner sense (which, insofar as we are aware of external things through internal states, pertains to the contents mediated by the outer sense as well), space and time are, according to Kant, nothing less than the *form* of sensory experience in general – in

16 It was, in essence, fully articulated already by the Pyrrhonic sceptics; after all, the ten tropes of Aenesidemus, as presented by Sextus Empiricus, are nothing else but a systematic exposition of the thesis: "ὅποῖον μὲν ἕκαστον τῶν ὑποκειμένων ἐμοὶ φαίνεται δυνήσομαι λέγειν, ὅποῖον δὲ ἔστι τῇ φύσει διὰ τὰ προειρημένα ἐπέχειν ἀναγκασθήσομαι." (*Pyrrh. hyp.*, I.78).

contrast to the raw data of sensation, which constitute the *matter* thereof. In Kant's view, then, the sphere of appearances is not constituted solely by the secondary qualities, such as colours, sounds, tastes and so forth, as Locke maintained, but rather by the primary qualities as well, as they are not conceivable unless we presuppose space and time. Accordingly, insofar as space and time are subjective forms, the qualities which necessarily presuppose them and are thus conditioned by them are just as subjective as space and time themselves. In other words, Kant teaches that the entire spatiotemporal world as we know it is mere appearance, because its spatiotemporality, which is its form, does not inhere to it, but is rather merely imposed upon it by the subject's sensibility.

The meaning of this thesis can be elucidated by the following consideration. The term 'appearance' does not bear the same meaning as 'illusion', it is no mere chimera or a deception of sorts; it is rather always an *appearance of something that appears*. Colours, for instance, are not a quality which inhere to material objects in themselves, that is, regardless of their relation to the senses of the perceiver; yet, they have a *real basis*, for they are in essence nothing else but the manner in which matter appears to us when it reflects light onto our retina, wherefore we can, in this sense, speak of colours as the manner of appearance of matter with regard to our sensibility, in particular to our visual system. In Kant's view, however, even matter itself is an appearance, insofar as it is constituted of properties which are conceivable only in space and time. Thus, he arrived at an incomparably more profound problem than any philosopher before him: if the material world as we know it is itself mere appearance, what is it an appearance of? What is truly real, if not the world as we know it? – Kant's considerations on this topic end on a sceptical note, as, according to him, the thing-in-itself is entirely unknown and for ever unknowable to us: there is simply no way for us to *perceive* other than through the prism of space and time.¹⁷

17 At this point, however, the possibility remains that, although we cannot come to cognize the thing-in-itself through the *senses*, we may somehow do so through the *intellect*, for Kant based his entire argumentation for the claim that the material world is mere appearance in the transcendental aesthetic on the consideration of the nature of human *sensibility*; indeed, such a persuasion has been advocated by important figures before Kant, such as Descartes or Leibniz, although they still operated with the restricted, purely material notion of 'appearance'. Let us concisely point out that this is a view which Kant strongly opposes and, as it seems to us, successfully refutes in the second part of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, namely the *transcendental logic*. There, he argues that *cognition* (*Erkenntnis*) in the true sense of the term only arises through the relation of the intellect to the objects of sense perception and that without this relation, the intellect only produces chimeras and dialectical reasoning. Thus, in Kant's doctrine, the problem is sufficiently dealt with, for, insofar as the

§3 Kant and Berkeley: On their Apparent Difference and Concealed Identity

As we have said in the general introduction to this chapter, there are crucial differences between the forms of idealism laid out by Kant and Berkeley which, although in truth merely formal, *prima facie* clearly separate them and make it seem that the two doctrines have little or nothing in common.

Now, as we have already mentioned, all of these difference stem from the fact that Kant is, at least in theory, a formal idealist. As we shall see, however, Kant's idealism can only be deemed *formal* idealism insofar as the central notion of his idealistic doctrine, namely the thing-in-itself, is deemed coherent. Accordingly, the answer to the question whether the idealisms of Kant and Berkeley coincide or not, that is, whether Kant is a *formal* or a *material* idealist, is, as we shall see, directly contingent upon the coherency of Kant's notion of the thing-in-itself. In other words, should the notion of the thing-in-itself as laid out by Kant turn out to be incoherent and therefore be put aside, it would become clear that, although Kant's idealism differs from Berkeley's in theory, practically they are the same. To demonstrate that the latter is not a mere hypothetical situation, but rather reality, is the objective of this paragraph. Before we proceed with the demonstration, however, let us consider the difference itself a little closer.

In total, there are two crucial and closely corresponding dichotomies employed by Kant, which, presupposing their coherence, strongly set him apart from Berkeley: that of *form* and *matter* on the one hand, and that of *appearance* and the *thing-in-itself* on the other. Anyone who is acquainted with Berkeley's works knows that Berkeley does not operate with any of these notions, that, according to him, the material world is *simpliciter* ontologically dependent on the mind, as it is essentially nothing but a complex of the mind's ideas, and that that is the end of the story¹⁸. In Berkeley's framework, it makes no sense to speak of any worldly entity beyond the mind, there is no thing-in-itself of which the spatiotemporal world could be an appearance: *esse est percipi* and if we abstract from the subject, we abstract from

use of the intellect only leads to cognition in relation to the objects of sense perception, it is evident that all cognition is necessarily bound by the formal conditions of sense perception, whence it is evident that all cognition is only concerned with *appearances*, not at all with things as they are in themselves. – A concise summary of these Kantian principles can be found in the first part of the chapter *Von dem Grunde der Unterscheidung aller Gegenstände überhaupt in Phaenomena und Noumena* (I. Kant, *KrV*, A235-248/B294-305).

18 If we exclude the aspect of the infinite spirit, that is, which we here take the liberty of doing.

all worldly being in general. Indeed, this is a most crucial difference which wholly justifies the distinction of formal and material idealism, of which the former pertains only to form and thereby leaves room for a thing-in-itself stripped of said form, whereas the latter pertains to things in their entirety and leaves no room for such a thing-in-itself. From the following passage of a letter to Jakob Sigismund Beck from 1792 pertaining to the main thesis of the *Göttinger Rezension*, namely the identification of Kant and Berkeley, it is evident that Kant himself considered this difference to be decisive when contrasting the two idealisms, for he says: “*Hrn Eberhards und Garven Meynung von der Identität des Berkeleyschen Idealisms mit dem critischen, den ich besser das Princip der Idealität des Raumes und der Zeit nennen könnte, verdient nicht die mindeste Aufmerksamkeit: denn ich rede von der Idealität in Ansehung der Form der Vorstellung: jene aber machen daraus Idealität derselben in Ansehung der Materie d.i. des Objects und seiner Existenz selber.*”¹⁹ – A few years earlier, in one of the passages constituting the official defense of his doctrine in the *Prolegomena*, he carries a similar train of thought further and arrives at the conclusion that, since he acknowledges the existence of things independent of the mind – the things-in-themselves – his position is in reality the complete opposite of material idealism.²⁰

Thus, we see that the notion of the thing-in-itself really is the central distinguishing feature of formal idealism with regard to the material idealism of Berkeley. Very well, but is the notion sustainable? Unfortunately, as we have already many times suggested, the answer is no. Let us consider why.

The problems with Kant’s version of the notion are numerous and have been observed ever since the publication of the first edition of the *Critique*.²¹ Nonetheless, we only wish to lay out what we believe to be the fundamental problem, which, according to us, is that the notion, as presented by Kant, is inherently nonsensical, because Kant conceived of that what things are in themselves, that is, of that what they are when we abstract from the qualities imposed upon them by consciousness, as of *things*, that is, in *physical* terms, which is evident

19 I. Kant, *Briefwechsel II (1789 – 1794)*, AA XI, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1900, p. 395.

20 I. Kant, *Prolegomena*, §13, Anm. II (A62-63). He speaks only of “*Idealism*” (*ibid.*), but it is evident from context that he means the Berkeleyan, ‘dogmatic’ sort.

21 Let us point out that – since, in the *Critique*, one can find two distinct notions of the thing-in-itself – we are here speaking only of the ‘metaphysical’ notion which Kant very often refers to as the “hidden cause” of our representations. The second notion is of course the thing-in-itself understood as a hypothetical *Grenzbegriff*, or Noumenon, which is here irrelevant.

from the fact that, on more occasions, he speaks of the ‘thing-in-itself’ resolutely as a *cause* of appearances or as an *object* underlying the appearances.²²

The reason why it is nonsensical to conceive of the ‘thing-in-itself’ as a *thing* is that such a notion amounts to nothing else but a notion of an unperceivable thing, which is a *contradictio in adiecto*. Of course, by that we do not mean that there are no things – understood *sensu proprio*, that is, as material bodies – which cannot be perceived by the naked eye, as that is the case, for instance, with atoms and even smaller, subatomic particles. We merely mean that it makes no sense to speak of a material entity – which a thing necessarily is – which is not perceivable *in principle*. This is evident from our previous example of an atom, for, although it is not perceivable by the naked eye, it is nevertheless, due to its material qualities, perceivable with the help of a microscope. The same necessarily applies to any material thing whatsoever: insofar as it is material, it is, in principle, perceivable.²³ Thus, since, on the one hand, Kant conceived of the thing-in-itself as a thing, and, on the other, he insists that it is neither in space nor in time, the notion is clearly a contradiction, because it amounts to nothing else but: an unperceivable thing.

That is, however, not the only possible conclusion to be drawn from the last stated premise, as, if we ignore the manner in which Kant speaks of the thing-in-itself – which strongly evokes its ‘thinghood’ – we can, instead of concluding that, due to it being neither in space nor in time, the thing-in-itself is a contradiction, come to the conclusion that it is *immaterial*. While Kant himself, as far as we know, never explicitly advocated the latter view and spoke of the thing-in-itself freely in physical terms²⁴, it was nevertheless very strongly

22 To state a few passages: *KrV*, A46/B63, A191/B236, A277/B333, A288/B344.

23 This formulation is inspired by Husserl, who uses it in the first volume of his *Ideas*: “*Es ist ja leicht anzusehen, daß wenn die unbekannte angeblich mögliche Ursache ist, sie prinzipiell wahrnehmbar sein müßte, [...]*” (E. Husserl, *Ideen ...*, *erstes Buch*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1976, §52). Husserl himself furnished the same criticism in his unpublished manuscripts, only in much more general terms, namely of his correlation between ‘*Sein*’ and ‘*Bewußtsein*’. See the manuscript excerpts quoted by Iso Kern in *Husserl und Kant*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1964, p. 121.

24 Of course, Kant himself also acknowledged the necessary consequences of the transcendental aesthetic; however, he breached them at every turn. This is especially clear in the following passage: “*Dieses Etwas [Ding an Sich, M.Z.] aber ist nicht ausgedehnt, nicht undurchdringlich, nicht zusammengesetzt, weil alle diese Prädikate nur die Sinnlichkeit und deren Anschauung angehen, so fern wir von dergleichen (uns übrigens unbekanntem) Objekten affiziert werden.*” (I. Kant, *KrV*, A358). Here, Kant maintains that something which is neither extended nor impenetrable, that is, necessarily immaterial, nevertheless has the capacity of causal efficacy – which is a clear contradiction, because causal efficacy in the proper sense of the term only pertains to physical, that is, material entities.

advocated by his most ingenious pupil, Schopenhauer. In fact, such a stance is much more consequential with regard to the principle of the ideality of space, for nothing can be material, that is, solid and impenetrable, without being extended. Such a view, however, insofar as it is advocated within the framework of the transcendental aesthetic, is easily dismissed, for it is utterly inconceivable and indeed impossible that a spatial, extended, material object should be an appearance of, that is, arise from something immaterial.²⁵

Thus, we can see that, on the principles set by the transcendental aesthetic, the notion of the thing-in-itself is unsustainable in both of its most prominent forms, and that, as a consequence, it cannot be allowed to play any role in the evaluation of the *actual* meaning of Kant's idealism. This meaning we shall now endeavour to bring to full light.

What remains after this necessary incision is still the entire doctrine of the transcendental aesthetic, that is, *en gros*, the principle of the ideality of space and time; however, its import changes drastically without the admission of the thing-in-itself, because it now makes Kant a clear cut material idealist. The reason is as follows: Kant refers to himself as a formal idealist, because he maintains that space and time, whose ideality he adamantly claims, constitute merely the *form* of the material world, wherefore the principle of ideality of space and time is supposed to only pertain to the form of material objects, but not to their matter. The problem with this claim is that it is impossible to conceive of any kind of matter without it being spatial. As we said, nothing can be material, that is, solid and impenetrable, without being extended. In other words, in the material world, form and matter cannot be separated²⁶. From this, it is evident that Kant's idealism does not at all pertain merely to the form of the material world, but rather to the material world as a whole, regardless of whether we refer to spatiotemporality as 'form' or not. It is precisely the latter linguistic practice which gives rise to the confusing superficial difference between Kant and Berkeley which we alluded to many times in the introduction to this chapter: for what Kant refers to as 'form' in truth

25 This also applies to a possible objection which could be made to the considerations of the previous paragraph, for one could argue that we *do* actually perceive the thing-in-itself, but that we only see it through the prism of the subjective forms, that is, only how it appears to us, not as it is in itself; for, since time and space along with all the attributes they are a necessary condition of are *ideal*, the thing-in-itself has to be immaterial: wherefore it itself certainly cannot be perceived.

26 This is why the philosopher working with the notion of a thing-in-itself is forced to either conceive of it in material, that is, physical terms, as in the case of Kant, or immaterial, that is, metaphysical terms, as in the case of Schopenhauer.

necessarily entails the material world as a whole, that is, even its matter, and therefore is not, in reality, mere ‘form’ at all.

Thus, we see that the difference between Kant and Berkeley is in fact merely formal, that is, pertaining solely to manner of expression, and that the transcendental aesthetic, insofar as it maintains the ideality of space and time²⁷, necessarily leads to material idealism: *quod erat demonstrandum*.

§4 Kant’s Defense

What remains now is to consider the manner in which Kant endeavoured to defend himself against the reproach of Berkeleyan idealism. It should be pointed out that, as numerous scholars have observed²⁸, Kant’s own characterizations of Berkeley’s position have little in common with the actual doctrine Berkeley advocated. We need not, however, dwell on this point, as we do not intend to determine the degree of accuracy of Kant’s interpretation of Berkeley, but rather to ascertain whether the argumentation which Kant presented as his defense can ultimately be deemed successful in or even in any way pertinent to repudiating the reproach of material idealism.

The essence of Kant’s defense is constituted by the claim that material idealism undermines the reality of things in space, whereas his own position preserves it and even reinforces its theoretical grounding by making clear that the empirical objects we come into contact with in our experience are grounded in a mind-independent reality (the thing-in-itself)²⁹. However, since, as we have seen, Kant’s notion of the thing-in-itself is nonsensical and there certainly is not, for there simply cannot be, any principally unperceivable material entity underlying reality, such a claim is essentially empty, because the non-existence of the thing-in-itself is equal to the non-existence of the very grounding through which Kant believed

27 It might seem that only the claim of the ideality of space pertains to the material world, but it is not so. Kant makes it very clear in *KrV*, A34/B50, that the form of the outer sense, that is, space, is subordinated to the form of the inner sense, that is, time, wherefore all spatial representations are necessarily subject to the formal conditions of the inner sense – time – as well. In other words, because Kant conceives of the material world as mere subjective representation, it is necessarily subject to the laws of consciousness.

28 See, for instance, N. K. Smith, “Kant’s Relation to Berkeley”, in: *A Commentary to Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason*, London: Macmillan, 1918, p. 156. – With regard to the question whether Kant was directly acquainted with Berkeley’s writings and if so, to what extent, see F. C. Beiser, *German Idealism*, pp. 99-102 for a detailed discussion and bibliography.

29 See I. Kant, *Prolegomena*, §13, Anm. II, III.

to have secured the reality of empirical objects. In other words, if we remove the thing-in-itself, we also *eo ipso* invalidate Kant's central argument against the charge of being a material idealist.

This being the case, the difference between undermining the reality of empirical objects and thus rendering them a mere illusion – which, according to Kant, Berkeley does – or holding fast to their reality only constitutes a *nominal* difference between two otherwise identical doctrines: for both Kant as well as Berkeley render the material world a mere representation. In other words, it is of no relevance whether one refers to empirical objects as 'real' or as 'illusory', insofar as one maintains they are mere representations. In this regard, it is also entirely irrelevant *how* one arrives at the conclusion, whether one simply speaks of empirical objects as *ideas* without any real attempt at a justification thereof, as in the case of Berkeley, or whether one meticulously contrives a complicated mechanism of synthesis by which empirical objects are supposed to arise and thus ultimately subjects all material reality to the laws of consciousness, as in the case of Kant, for the result remains the same: the material world is pronounced dependent on the mind.

Thus, since, as we have shown, the transcendental aesthetic, the very foundation of the *Critique*, itself already fully entails material idealism, we must conclude that, once the transcendental aesthetic had been written, nothing could have been done within Kant's system to save it from the identification with material idealism.

Second Part: Husserl

§5 General Introduction

Although the objective of this chapter is identical with that of the previous one, namely to make clear that and why the author in question is, in truth, a material idealist, the steps necessary for achieving said objective will be slightly different. That is, of course, a consequence of the fact that the idealistic doctrines of Kant and Husserl differ quite profoundly and therefore stand in a significantly different relation to the idealism of Berkeley. The main point of this difference consists in the fact that Husserl's idealism, as opposed to Kant's, does *not* possess the structure of transcendental, or, as we prefer to call it, formal idealism. As we have seen above (§3), the essential feature of formal idealism, the basis around which everything therein revolves, is nothing else but the notion of the thing-in-itself – a notion which Husserl wholeheartedly dismisses as pure nonsense³⁰. Consequently, the apparent difference which we had to tackle when we considered the relation of Kant's idealism to that of Berkeley is not there at all in the case of Husserl. As we shall see, the doctrine Husserl refers to as “transcendental idealism” simply entails material idealism as it is. A mere exposition thereof will make that sufficiently clear.

Thus, in the following, we shall first provide an exposition of Husserl's idealism and make it completely clear that and why it entails material idealism (§6), whereafter we will also – since Husserl's interpretation of his own idealism is radically different from the one we are arguing for here – endeavour to demonstrate in detail the falsity of Husserl's claim that he is a transcendental idealist and phenomenology nothing else but transcendental idealism (§7). Then, we will consider Husserl's attempt at an explicit delimitation of his own idealism from that of Berkeley and show that his effort is of no consequence for our thesis (§8).

These three paragraphs shall constitute the proper essence of this chapter, as they will all, be it directly or indirectly, contribute to the demonstration of our thesis that Husserl's

³⁰ See the very explicit manuscript excerpts quoted in I. Kern, *Husserl und Kant, loc. cit.* As regards Husserl's published texts, see E. Husserl, *Ideen ... , erstes Buch* (hereafter *Ideen I*), Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1976, §52 and *Cartesische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge* (hereafter *Cart. Med.*), Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1950, §41. In the latter, Husserl's dismissal of the notion of the thing-in-itself is not directly expressed, but is nevertheless clear from the manner he speaks of it. He speaks of “*angeblich prinzipiell unerkennbare(r) Dinge an sich*” and differentiates himself from ‘Kantian idealism’, “*der mindestens als Grenzbegriff die Möglichkeit einer Welt von Dingen an sich glaubt offen halten zu können*”, making it clear that he himself does not share that belief.

idealistic doctrine is in truth nothing but a specific form of material idealism. There is, however, another point we will have to dwell upon in order to bring our objective to completion, namely the fact that, while, as we shall see, in all of Husserl's official formulations of his idealistic doctrine, material idealism is most clearly entailed, there is another important tenet concerning the material world present in his philosophy which is utterly irreconcilable with this doctrine, because it points towards a diametrically opposed position, namely material realism. Thus, at the end of the chapter, a paragraph will be devoted to a concise discussion of this tenet, the internal inconsistency of Husserl's ontology resulting from its clash with his idealistic doctrine, as well as to showing that the presence of this tenet in Husserl's philosophy in no way diminishes the veracity of our thesis.

§6 Husserl's Idealism

If one wishes to provide an exposition of the manner in which Husserl conceived of a particular concept or tackled a specific topic, it is necessary to first decide which work one will consider as its official representative. Husserl wrote most extensively, never settled for the results he obtained at any given moment, developed his concepts rigorously and typically soon grew discontent with his latest published works³¹, all of which makes it in the very least questionable to discuss any given topic of Husserl's thought in general terms. Fortunately, in the case of Husserl's idealism, the choice of a representative text is quite simple: there is only one text published in Husserl's lifetime which contains an explicit and systematic articulation of the doctrine Husserl referred to as "transcendental idealism", namely the *Cartesian Meditations* (1931), the text in which the mature form of phenomenology had for the first time been rigorously laid out³².

31 When Husserl's pupil Roman Ingarden said to Husserl in 1927 he was teaching about the first volume of his *Logical Investigations* at the University of Lwów, he replied: "Ach, warum haben Sie dies gelesen, da habe ich mich so verrannt." (R. Ingarden, *On the Motives which led Husserl to Transcendental Idealism*, trans. by A. Hannibalsson, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1975, p. 8). Husserl was also dissatisfied with both of his main systematic expositions of phenomenology, namely with the first volume of *Ideas* (see J. N. Mohanty, "The Development of Husserl's Thought", in: *The Cambridge Companion to Husserl*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 61) as well as with the *Cartesian Meditations* (R. Ingarden, *op. cit.*, p. 2).

32 When it comes to lectures and manuscripts, however, the situation is quite different. The term "transcendental idealism" first appears in a research manuscript from 1908 (E. Husserl, *Transzendentaler Idealismus: Texte aus dem Nachlass (1908 – 1921)*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003, p. 27). Another research manuscript from the same year contains a "demonstration of phenomenological idealism" (E. Husserl, *ibid.*, p. 60). A full-fledged public exposition of Husserl's idealism appears already in the 1913

In nuce, Husserl's idealism consists in the following thesis:

“Jeder erdenkliche Sinn, jedes erdenkliche Sein, ob es immanent oder transzendent heißt, fällt in den Bereich der transzendentalen Subjektivität als der Sinn und Sein konstituierenden.”³³

This statement represents the most general expression of Husserl's idealism, as it extends over all being in general. For us, however, only a part of this statement is relevant, namely the claim that all *transcendent* being is constituted by the subject, for, since, in Husserl's technical jargon, the term “transcendent being” signifies, among other things³⁴, the material world³⁵, it is completely clear that the most mature and general expression of Husserl's idealism entails material idealism.

It is not, however, the doctrine of constitution *per se* which makes Husserl a material idealist, but rather what its admission implies, namely the *principle of relativity*³⁶. According to this principle, the material world does not subsist in itself (*an sich*), but is, in essence (*wesensmäßig*), relative to the perceiving subject. In other words, it consists in the claim that the existence of the material world is entirely relative to and, as such, dependent on consciousness, which alone is ‘absolute’ or ‘irrelative’³⁷. Clearly, this principle amounts to

lectures *Natur und Geist* and then in the 1915 lectures *Ausgewählte Probleme der Phänomenologie* (E. Husserl, *ibid.*, texts no. 5 and 6). For a chronological overview of all appearances of the term, see D. De Santis, “Fourth Cartesian Meditation”, in: D. De Santis (ed.), *Husserl, The Cartesian Meditations. Commentary and Interpretation*, Berlin: De Gruyter (forthcoming 2022), sec. 2.

33 E. Husserl, *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge* (hereafter *Cart. Med.*), Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1950, §41.

34 For instance, the essences (*Wesen*), see E. Husserl, *Ideen I*, §38.

35 See E. Husserl, *Ideen I*, §38, 42 and *Cart. Med.*, §11, 28.

36 Since we do not base our account of Husserl as a material idealist on his doctrine of constitution *per se*, but rather its connection to the principle of relativity, an objection of the sort that Heidegger puts forth in his 1925 Marburg lecture, namely that, for Husserl, “‘Konstituieren’ meint nicht Herstellen als Machen und Verfertigen, sondern Sehenlassen des Seienden in seiner Gegenständlichkeit” (M. Heidegger, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, Frankfurt am Main: V. Klosterman, 1979, §6), appealed to by modern defenders of Husserl, such as Karl Ameriks (“Husserl's Realism”, in: *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 86, No. 4, 1977, p. 505), would be entirely irrelevant here.

37 This principle figures so prominently in Husserl's manuscripts, texts and lectures that deal with his idealism that it can without any hesitation be designated the very essence thereof. It makes its first public appearance in the year 1913, namely in the first volume of *Ideen* and in the lectures *Natur und Geist*. In the former, Husserl concludes the infamous §49 with the following words: “*Andererseits ist die ganze räumlich-zeitliche Welt [...] ihrem Sinne nach bloßes intentionales Sein, also ein solches, das den bloßen sekundären, relativen Sinn eines Seins für ein Bewußtsein hat. Es ist ein Sein, das das Bewußtsein in seinen Erfahrungen setzt [...]*”

nothing else but a more complex and technical formulation of the central principle of Berkeley's idealism and indeed all forms of material idealism in general, that is, *esse est percipi*. It follows that, insofar as Husserl's official formulation of his idealistic doctrine entails the principle of relativity, it is, entirely *unequivocally*, material idealism.

This entailment is confirmed by Husserl himself in a text stemming from the same period as the *Cartesian Meditations*, namely the *Nachwort* to the first volume of *Ideas*³⁸. Although this text is largely retrospective, looking back at the first exposition of phenomenology from 1913, it is nevertheless of great importance even in the context of Husserl's mature thought, especially when it comes to the topic of idealism, because, in §5 thereof, Husserl *explicitly* addresses the issue of the (mis-)interpretation of his idealistic position and endeavours to set the record straight, so to speak. It is precisely in this paragraph of the *Nachwort* where we find a more explicit formulation of the aforementioned statement concerning transcendent being from the *Cartesian Meditations* which makes clear beyond all doubt that it implies the principle of relativity. Husserl says: "*Das Ergebnis der phänomenologischen Sinnesklärung der Seinsweise der realen Welt und einer erdenklichen realen Welt überhaupt ist, daß [...] die reale Welt zwar ist, aber eine wesensmäßige Relativität*

darüber hinaus aber ein Nichts ist." (E. Husserl, *Ideen I*, §49). In the latter, the principle of relativity is elaborated in much more detail. The conclusion of Husserl's considerations therein laid out is: "*Die Welt, jede erdenkliche Welt überhaupt ist nur denkbar als relativ, relativ zu der Wirklichkeit von Bewusstsein.*" – "*Während Bewusstsein, die Sphäre möglichen immanenten Seins, existieren kann, ohne dass irgendeine transzendente Realität ist, ist das Sein von Transzendente durchaus abhängig vom Sein eines Bewusstseins.*" (E. Husserl, *Transzendentaler Idealismus*, text no. 5, pp. 78-79).

38 The finished manuscript of the *Cartesian Meditations* was sent by Husserl to Straßburg to be translated into French in May of 1929 (see S. Strasser, "Einleitung", in: E. Husserl, *Cart. Med.*, p. xxvi). Since, in the *Nachwort*, Husserl refers to the *Cartesian Meditations* as "*ein in Werk stehendes [...] Buch*" (E. Husserl, "Nachwort", in: *Ideen ..., drittes Buch*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1952, p. 140), the *Nachwort* itself must have been written either sometime before the original German manuscript or the translation into French was finished. The fact that, in the *Nachwort*, Husserl mentions that the *Meditations* should be published "*zu Anfang des nächsten Jahres*" (E. Husserl, *ibid.*), suggests the second option, because the *Nachwort* was published in 1930, meaning that by 'next year', he most likely meant 1931, which is the year in which the *Meditations* were actually first published; indeed, this is further supported by Husserl's remark in a letter to Ingarden from the 21st of December 1930: "*Sehr betrübt bin ich, daß die Méditations Cartésiennes noch immer nicht vollendet sind, obschon im Sommer schon der Satz vollendet war, nur die letzte Korrektur fehlte noch.*" (quoted by Strasser, *op. cit.*, p. xxvii), which suggests that Husserl in fact expected the French translation to appear at the beginning of 1931. Nonetheless, this is not certain, and the possibility still remains that the *Nachwort* was written in 1929. – One thing, we can establish for sure: if we consider that Husserl began working on the *Cartesian Meditations* after the Paris lectures, which were held on the 23rd and 25th of February 1929 (S. Strasser, *op. cit.*, p. xxiii), it is certain that the *Nachwort* could not have been written any sooner than that, because it refers to the *Meditations*. From this alone, it is clear that the *Nachwort* stands in great proximity to the *Meditations*.

*hat auf die transzendente Subjektivität, da sie nämlich ihren Sinn als seiende nur haben kann als intentionales Sinngebilde der transzendentalen Subjektivität.*³⁹ – This statement evidently shows that to be constituted by transcendental subjectivity, or, as Husserl puts it, to be its “*intentionales Sinngebilde*”, means to be essentially (*wesensmäßig*) relative to it.

Consequently, insofar as Husserl, in §41 of the *Cartesian Meditations*, claims the former, he *eo ipso*, although merely *implicite*, claims the latter⁴⁰. Furthermore, since, as we have seen, to be essentially relative to consciousness means nothing but to be entirely dependent on it, it is evident that the official formulation of Husserl’s idealistic doctrine entails material idealism and that, as a consequence, Husserl is, as regards his idealistic doctrine, a material idealist: *quod erat demonstrandum*.

§7 On the Nature of Husserl’s Idealism

Despite all of this evidence which shows beyond all doubt that Husserl is a material idealist, Husserl himself confidently claims that his idealistic doctrine is nothing else but *transcendental idealism*. The identification thereof with transcendental idealism permeates, ever since the term first appeared, almost all the main periods of Husserl’s writings, be it in unpublished manuscripts, lectures, published works or letters⁴¹. Once again, we find the official public statement of this identification in the already mentioned §41 of the *Cartesian Meditations*, where we read that phenomenology, in its “*systematische[r] Konkretion durchgeführt, ist [...] eo ipso transzendentaler Idealismus*”⁴².

This claim, however, is entirely unjustified and untrue. The reason we have already stated in §5: Husserl fully dismisses the notion which constitutes the very soul of transcendental idealism, the thing-in-itself. Indeed, claiming to be a transcendental idealist whilst disputing the notion of the thing-in-itself is just as preposterous as claiming to be a

39 E. Husserl, “Nachwort”, p. 153.

40 Why not *explicite*, if the principle of relativity constitutes the essence of Husserl’s idealism, as we have said above (footnote 8)? Because the doctrine of constitution is not a replacement of the principle, but rather its elaboration – it specifies the nature of the relation on which said relativity is grounded as that of ‘constitution’.

41 For more details, see D. De Santis, “Fourth Cartesian Meditation”, sec. 2 (pp. 1-3). Husserl only stopped using the term in the last years of his life, from around the year 1930. However, from what we know, it seems he merely began avoiding it because of its connotations and their correlative interpretative consequences, rather than because he abandoned the position altogether. See the two remarks made by Husserl in 1934, one in a letter and the other in a public lecture, quoted by De Santis *ibidem*.

42 E. Husserl, *Cart. Med.*, §41.

materialist whilst disputing the existence of matter. The claim's falsity is perhaps even clearer from the fact that there is no way at all in which Husserl's idealism could ever be referred to as *formal* idealism, a term which is completely synonymous to transcendental idealism as its originator – and therefore its *absolute* authority – conceived of it⁴³. It is clear that Husserl's idealism does not pertain only to the form of material objects, but rather *simpliciter* to material objects as such, to their entire *Sein*. Finally, the sheer absurdity of Husserl's claim is evident from the fact that, just a few lines below the above quoted statement, he proclaims of his “transcendental idealism”: “*Nicht ist es ein Kantianischer Idealismus*”⁴⁴, essentially saying nothing else but: it is not transcendental idealism⁴⁵.

Let us emphasize, however, that we are *not* disputing the claim that phenomenology is a transcendental project. That is, as far as we are concerned, true beyond all doubt. We are merely saying that Husserl's idealistic doctrine is not transcendental idealism, which by no means contradicts the claim that phenomenology is a transcendental project. Let us consider the relation between the two a little bit closer.

The meaning of the term ‘transcendental’, when used in this context, stems, of course, from Kant. It is a qualifying adjective whose purpose is to signify a specific perspective characteristic for modern philosophy since Descartes. Transcendental cognition (*transzendente Erkenntnis*) is cognition *a priori* pertaining not to things, as is the case of empirical cognition, but only to the cognitive faculties (*Erkenntnisvermögen*) through which we cognize things⁴⁶. In specific, it pertains solely to “*daß und wie gewisse Vorstellungen [...] lediglich a priori angewandt werden, oder möglich sind*”⁴⁷.

Accordingly, the term *Transzendentalphilosophie* represents a strand of philosophy which investigates the subject's cognitive faculties and the *a priori* conditions under which the subject has or can have certain representations. This being the case, phenomenology is clearly

43 We can, true, also find the dichotomy of “form” and “matter” (ὕλη) in Husserl's texts, however clearly in a completely different sense, for otherwise he would have, of necessity, arrived at the notion of the thing-in-itself.

44 E. Husserl, *ibid.*

45 It makes no sense at all to speak of a transcendental idealism “*in einem grundwesentlich neuen Sinne*” (E. Husserl, *ibid.*), as if the term had no master. There is only one transcendental idealism, whose only and absolute authority is, as we have said, Kant.

46 I. Kant, *Prolegomena*, §13.

47 I. Kant, *KrV*, A56/B80.

part of the transcendental tradition⁴⁸. However, this does not at all entail that Husserl's idealism, albeit established within a transcendental project, is also *eo ipso* transcendental idealism, a doctrine which, as we have seen, presupposes a distinction of *form* and *matter* and the corresponding notion of the thing-in-itself which Husserl does not at all operate with, nay, explicitly condemns. At the same time, Husserl's material idealism does not collide with the fact that phenomenology is a transcendental project: after all, in its most general sense, *Transzendentalphilosophie* is simply a philosophy approaching the world from the perspective of the subject as the locus of awareness, and material idealism, in its most explicit form, nothing but a reduction of the existence of the material world to the constitutive acts of the subject's cognitive faculties⁴⁹.

What is Husserl's idealism, then, if not, as he claims, transcendental idealism? Based on our analysis, the most accurate and explicit designation would be *material idealism within a transcendental framework*. However, in order to make justice to all the idiosyncracies and specifics of Husserl's doctrine, we believe it best to refer to it strictly as *phenomenological idealism*. This term encapsulates at once all its essential characteristics as well as perhaps the most important aspect of Husserl's idealism, namely that it is a doctrine arrived at by means of the phenomenological perspective and method. It describes nothing else but how the world manifests itself to us from the perspective of the "*Korrelativeinstellung*": as a mere correlate of consciousness⁵⁰.

§8 Husserl's Defense

In general, Husserl presents us with two lines of defense against the identification of his idealism with that of Berkeley.

The first we find strongly expressed in §55 of the first volume of the *Ideas* as well as in

48 "Ich selbst gebrauche das wort 'transzendental' in einem weitesten Sinne für das [...] originale Motiv, das durch Descartes in allen neuzeitlichen Philosophien das sinngebende ist, [...]. Es ist das Motiv des Rückfragens nach der letzten Quelle aller Erkenntnisbildungen, des Sichbesinnens des Erkennenden auf sich selbst und sein erkennendes Leben, etc." (E. Husserl, *Krisis*, §26).

49 In Berkeley's texts, the aspect of constitution is merely implicit. It was only made explicit by Kant through his notion of "synthesis".

50 "In der Korrelativeinstellung, die [die Epoché] schafft, wird die Welt, das Objektive, selbst zu einem besonderen Subjektiven." (E. Husserl, *ibid.*, §53). Accordingly, the term *phenomenological idealism* also adequately emphasizes the important fact that Husserl's idealistic doctrine can only be deemed consistent with reality insofar as the phenomenological perspective itself is deemed consistent with reality.

the late *Nachwort* to the *Ideas*. In the former, having summarized his idealistic claims, Husserl adds: “*Wer angesichts unserer Erörterung einwendet, das hieße alle Welt in subjektiven Schein verwandeln und sich einem ‘Berkeley’schen Idealismus’ in die Arme werfen, dem können wir nur erwidern, daß er den Sinn dieser Erörterungen nicht erfaßt hat. Dem vollgültigen Sein der Welt, als dem All der Realitäten, ist so wenig etwas abgezogen, als dem vollgültigen geometrischen Sein des Vierecks dadurch, daß man (was in diesem Falle freilich eine plane Selbstverständlichkeit ist) leugnet, daß es rund ist.*”⁵¹ Quite in the same manner, in the latter, Husserl maintains that the primary point of difference between his and the traditional form of idealism is that “*der phänomenologische Idealismus leugnet nicht die wirkliche Existenz der realen Welt [...], als ob er meinte, daß sie ein Schein wäre, [...].*”⁵² In these passages, Husserl identifies Berkeleyan idealism with the position which renders the material world a mere subjective illusion and then refutes any possible identification thereof with his position by emphasising that he himself in no way denies the actual existence of the world. Clearly, this is an interpretation of Berkeley and response in essence completely identical to the interpretation and argument put forth by Kant (§4). As such, it is, *mutatis mutandis*, subject to precisely the same criticism which we have given above of the Kantian argument itself: insofar as Husserl claims that material objects are essentially relative to or – which is the same thing – dependent on consciousness, it is irrelevant whether he refers to them as ‘real’ or as ‘illusory’.

The second we find in another passage of Husserl’s already mentioned attempt at a distinction of his “transcendental-phenomenological” idealism from traditional idealism in the *Nachwort* to the *Ideas*. In it, Husserl claims that Berkeley (as well as Hume and others) has not yet arrived at the distinction of psychological subjectivity from transcendental subjectivity, wherefore his idealism, as opposed to Husserl’s, is merely “psychological” and as such, countersensical (*widersinnig*). He writes: “*Solange man nur die psychologische Subjektivität kennt und sie absolut setzt und doch die Welt als ihr bloßes Korrelat erklären will, ist der Idealismus widersinnig, ist er psychologischer Idealismus.*”⁵³ Further below, we read that psychological idealism is a consequence of the fact that: “[...] *der Kontrast zwischen*

51 E. Husserl, *Ideen I*, §55.

52 E. Husserl, “*Nachwort*”, p. 152.

53 E. Husserl, *ibid.*, p. 154.

*psychologischer und transzendentaler Subjektivität ungeklärt blieb und der vorherrschende englische Sensualismus oder Naturalismus Konstitution von Realem nicht als eine intentionale, Sinn und wahres Sein für die transzendente Subjektivität ergebende Leistung verständlich machen konnte, [...]*⁵⁴.

In these passages, Husserl is leaning on two doctrinal points of phenomenology which he believes to distinguish his idealism from that of Berkeley as well as other idealists⁵⁵.

(a) The first is the phenomenological reinterpretation of Kant's distinction between transcendental and psychological consciousness. In truth, this distinction is one of the central tenets of phenomenology, as the discovery of the transcendental ego by means of the *epoché* is its ultimate foundation. For this reason, as well as because the nature of the *epoché* is one of the most discussed topics in Husserl's texts, it would be impossible for us to discuss this distinction in its full extent without obscuring the objective of this paragraph. Let us restrict ourselves to a very concise exposition.⁵⁶

According to Husserl, there are two fundamental ways of considering our own selves and human beings in general, namely either from the perspective of psychology or phenomenology⁵⁷. The former perspective conceives of the human being as a psycho-physical unity with a certain psychological inner experience (*Seelenleben*), where 'psychological' means that the experience is considered as constituted of psychic phenomena which are part of the overall psycho-physical unity we call 'human being' (*Mensch*)⁵⁸. The latter perspective, on the other hand, conceives of the human being solely as an *ego cogitans*, the subjective pole (*Ichpol*) of intentionality which exercises certain constitutive acts (*cogitationes*) to bring about its intentional correlates (*cogitata*)⁵⁹.

For us, the most important point is that psychology conceives of the human being as a

54 E. Husserl, *ibid.*

55 In the following, we shall, for the sake of clarity and conciseness, always only speak of Berkeley as the target of Husserl's criticism, even though the criticism extends over many other philosophers.

56 For this purpose, we shall mainly utilize §11 of the *Cartesian Meditations* along with relevant passages from *Ideas II* and §54 of the *Crisis of European Sciences*.

57 For the sake of clarity and conciseness, we are abstracting from the other ways Husserl identifies in the second volume of the *Ideas*.

58 E. Husserl, *Cart. Med.*, §11.

59 E. Husserl, *Ideen ... zweites Buch*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1952, §22. Cf. *Krisis*, §54a: "[...] in der radikalen Konsequenz der Epoché [kommt] jedes Ich rein nur als Ichpol seiner Akte und Habitualitäten und Vermögen in Betracht, [...]."

certain *reality*, that, by virtue of its psycho-*physical* nature, the psychologically construed ego is situated within the context of space and time⁶⁰ and, as such, considered *part of the world*⁶¹. For, although Husserl himself does not explicitly say so in the *Nachwort*, it is clear from §54 of the *Crisis of European Sciences* that this is the reason why Husserl maintains that an idealism based on a psychologically construed subjectivity is countersensical: because it subordinates the world to an ego which is itself part of the world. Without contradiction, the world can be declared dependent only on the *transcendental ego*, the ultimate ground of intentionality. For the phenomenologist – who performs the *epoché* – the psychological ego is merely another worldly phenomenon constituted by the transcendental ego among others.

(b) The second, which is present only implicitly in the second quoted passage from the *Nachwort*, is yet another highly important tenet of phenomenology, namely the distinction between *real* and *intentional* contents of consciousness. Husserl articulated this distinction fully already in the crucial fifth chapter of the second volume of the *Logical Investigations*, where, for the first time, he introduces at length his phenomenological notion of consciousness understood as the locus of intentional *Erlebnisse*. In short, *real* contents of consciousness are those that are an actual material part of the *Erlebnis*, whereas *intentional* contents those that are “contained within” the *Erlebnis* merely intentionally, that is, towards which the *Erlebnis* is intentionally directed. For instance, when we perceive a color, we can, as per Husserl’s analysis, distinguish three basic aspects: (i) the physiological sensory data, (ii) the psychological percept which arises on the basis of those data and (iii) the object which is perceived by means of the percept. Thus, we have an *intentional Erlebnis* – the perception of a color – of which the *real* component is the sensory datum and the *intentional* component the perceived object.⁶²

Now, when, in the second passage from the *Nachwort* quoted above, Husserl says that “*der vorherrschende englische Sensualismus oder Naturalismus Konstitution von Realem nicht als eine intentionale [...] Leistung verständlich machen konnte.*”, he is referring to a

60 “Nur durch die Erfahrungsbeziehung zum Leibe wird Bewußtsein zum real menschlichen [...] und nur dadurch gewinnt es Stellung im Raume der Natur und in der Zeit der Natur, [...]” (E. Husserl, *Ideen I*, §53).

61 “Das Seelenleben, von dem die Psychologie spricht, ist ja allzeit gemeint gewesen und gemeint als Seelenleben in der Welt.” (E. Husserl, *Cart. Med.*, §11).

62 E. Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen, zweiter Band*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1984, V. Untersuchung, especially §11 and §17.

specific doctrine which he repeatedly criticized ever since the *Logical Investigations*⁶³ and which he ascribed to and specifically emphasized in the case of Berkeley⁶⁴, namely the identification of material objects with complexes of sensation (*Empfindungskomplexe*), which, in Husserl's terms, amounts to a gross confusion of *real* and *intentional* contents of consciousness. As Iso Kern concisely puts it, in Husserl's view, "*Berkeley [verfiel] einem Psychologismus besonderer Art, der die synthetische intentionale Dingeinheit mit dem jeweiligen Komplex der Empfindungsdaten, also mit etwas reell Psychischem verwechselt.*"⁶⁵

Thus, we have arrived at the standpoint from which we can evaluate the consequences of these assertions for the ontological orientation of Husserl's idealism.

As regards point (b), it is easy to see that the difference therein emphasized is akin to that between claiming that material objects are illusory and holding fast to their reality, wherefore we can, once again, say that, insofar as Husserl maintains that the material world is nothing without consciousness, it does not matter whether he conceives of things as complexes of sensation or as intentional unities, although, to be sure, the former is much cruder.

While roughly the same can be said of point (a), it nevertheless seems to carry at least some weight, as it presents a seemingly fundamental difference between Husserl's and Berkeley's idealism. Husserl clearly believes that the fact that he bases his idealism on the *transcendental ego* in such a strict manner completely separates him from traditional idealism. In truth, however, the difference between the transcendental and psychological ego as presented in the *Nachwort* is most chimerical. For, Husserl writes as if the two terms referred to two distinct entities within the human mind, when in fact they merely refer to one and the same thing – human subjectivity – seen from two different perspectives and defined in different terms. Husserl acts as if the fact that he defines the ego to which he subordinates the entire material world differently distinguished him from material idealism, when, in reality, nothing could be farther from the truth. For, while it is *theoretically* different to base idealism on the transcendental and not on the psychological ego – as they are two different concepts

63 See E. Husserl, *ibid.*, V. Untersuchung, 2. Kapitel and VI. Untersuchung, Beilage, §5, No. 3.

64 E. Husserl, *Erste Philosophie I (1923-24): Kritische Ideengeschichte*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1956, 21. Vorlesung, pp. 150-151, 25. Vorlesung, pp. 173-174; *Krisis*, §23, pp. 88-89.

65 I. Kern, *Husserl und Kant*, p. 312. Cf. E. Husserl, *Formale und transzendente Logik*, §65-66, where the connection of this kind of psychologism with psychological or 'psychological' idealism is made.

with different definitions –, *practically* it is completely the same thing. The distinction of a transcendental and psychological ego is merely an instrument of epistemological precision, as the term “transcendental ego” refers to that *aspect* of consciousness which is always identical regardless of the constant flux of its contents, that is, regardless of the “psychological ego”, the *Seelenleben in der Welt*. *In concreto*, however, there are not actually two egos, but only one. In other words, the distinction between “transcendental” and “psychological” exists only *in abstracto* as an expression of separate aspects of one and the same ego *in concreto*. Even Kant, the originator of the distinction of transcendental and psychological consciousness himself, says: “*Der Unterschied des Transzendentalen und Empirischen*⁶⁶ *gehört nur zur Kritik der Erkenntnisse und betrifft nicht die Beziehung derselben auf ihren Gegenstand*”⁶⁷.

Thus, it is clear that, although Husserl’s defense does point out some differences between him and Berkeley which, at first sight, seem promising, in the final analysis, they are of no real consequence for the fact that Husserl is a material idealist.

§9 On the Internal Inconsistency of Husserl’s Ontology

Having established that Husserl’s idealistic doctrine, as formulated in §41 of the *Cartesian Meditations*, entails material idealism, it is now time to address the issue which we had outlined in the introduction to this chapter, namely that Husserl’s idealism is contradicted by another important tenet of his concerning the material world.

The tenet we have in mind is that of the transcendence of material objects, that is, the view that material objects are transcendent with regard to consciousness. Clearly, such a view is entirely incompatible with the principle of relativity, according to which material objects are dependent on consciousness, for to be transcendent with regard to consciousness by definition means to be ‘without’ and therefore ‘independent of’ consciousness. Consequently, insofar as Husserl simultaneously claims that the material world is essentially relative to – and therefore dependent on – consciousness, that is, that its *esse* is *percipi*, as well as that material objects are transcendent with regard to – and therefore independent of – consciousness⁶⁸, he gravely

66 The term ‘empirical’ is synonymous to the in modernity more prevalent term ‘psychological’. Even Kant already speaks of an ‘empirical’ and ‘psychological’ idealism interchangeably.

67 I. Kant, *KrV*, A57/B81.

68 See E. Husserl, *Ideen I*, §42 and *Cart. Med.*, §11.

contradicts himself. The two tenets are irreconcilable: one can either have the one, or the other, but not both⁶⁹.

This tenet also projects itself into Husserl's regional ontology, where the same inconsistency is likewise evident. Husserl maintains that 'consciousness' (the sphere of immanent being) and 'nature' (the sphere of transcendent being) are two separate regions⁷⁰, instead of 'nature' being a sub-region of consciousness, as it should be, were Husserl's regional ontology in agreement with his idealism. At the same time, however, his idealistic doctrine implies a complete subordination of the region 'nature' to the region 'consciousness', for it consists in the claim that all the objectivities belonging to the region 'nature' are constituted by and therefore relative to consciousness. Once again, only one position can obtain at a time, not both.

For us, the main question is whether the presence of this tenet changes anything about the veracity of our thesis, namely that Husserl is a material idealist. It is clear, however, that the answer is no, for our thesis is only concerned with Husserl's *idealistic doctrine*, not each and every aspect of his philosophy, and we believe to have made it completely evident that this doctrine entails material idealism. From this vantage, Husserl is a material idealist without any doubt. Whether the remaining points of his philosophy are in keeping with his adherence to the doctrine of idealism he developed is quite a different matter, just like the question whether said doctrine itself is consistent with reality.

69 Berkeley and Kant are free of this charge, because they both considered material objects to be immanent to consciousness; the former by declaring them *ideas*, the latter *representations*. The fact that they both acknowledged that material objects are located in space changes nothing about this.

70 There is no particular passage where Husserl claims this, it is rather the very framework within which phenomenology as a science is established. The chief purpose of the first volume of *Ideas*, for instance, is the isolation of the region 'pure consciousness' from the region 'nature' by means of the *epoché*, whereafter it is introduced as the domain of a new science called phenomenology. Phenomenology thus inherently presupposes the isolation of the region 'consciousness' from the region 'nature'. This is particularly evident in E. Husserl, *Ideen I*, §33.

Conclusion

In this text, we have set out to demonstrate that the idealistic doctrines of Kant and Husserl, which bear a great formal resemblance and even the same name, are, in truth, nothing but different forms of Berkeleyan or material idealism. Based on the investigations carried out in the preceding two chapters, we can conclude that Kant is a material idealist without any further qualification, insofar as he does not contradict his idealism within his own system, whereas Husserl is a material idealist only as far as his idealistic doctrine in particular is concerned, because his philosophy as a whole also entails another tenet concerning the material world, namely that of the transcendence of material things, which implies material realism and therefore contradicts said doctrine.

Regardless of this difference, in both cases, the conclusion is of grave philosophical consequence, for, since material idealism is an absurd doctrine entirely inconsistent with reality – as it makes the very condition of the existence of consciousness, the material world, dependent thereon –, it follows that, insofar as the idealistic doctrines of Kant and Husserl amount to material idealism, their doctrines are both themselves inconsistent with reality. Thus, the ultimate conclusion of this thesis is that both Kant as well as Husserl have failed to grasp properly the relation between consciousness and the world.

Bibliography

1. Primary sources

1.1 Philosophy

Heidegger, Martin

Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs. GA 20. Frankfurt am Main: V. Klosterman, 1979.

Husserl, Edmund

Briefwechsel II: Die Münchener Phänomenologen. Hua Dokumente III. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994.

Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge (= Cart. Med.). Hua I. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1950.

Erste Philosophie I (1923-24): Kritische Ideengeschichte. Hua VII. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1956.

Formale und transzendente Logik. Versuch einer Kritik der logischen Vernunft. Hua XVII. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1974.

Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch (= Ideen I). Hua III/1. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1976.

Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Zweites Buch. Hua IV. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1952.

Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Hua VI. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1954.

Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Band. Hua XIX. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1984.

“Nachwort”, in: *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Drittes Buch*. Hua V. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1952.

Transzendentaler Idealismus: Texte aus dem Nachlass (1908 – 1921). Hua XXXVI. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.

Ingarden, Roman

On the Motives which led Husserl to Transcendental Idealism. Trans. by A. Hannibalsson, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1975.

Kant, Immanuel

Briefwechsel II (1789-1794). AA XI. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1900.

Handschriftlicher Nachlaß V. AA XVIII. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928.

Kritik der reinen Vernunft (= *KrV*). Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1998.

Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik (= *Prolegomena*). Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 2001.

Locke, John

An Essay concerning Human Understanding. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Schopenhauer, Arthur

Parerga und Paralipomena, erster Band, in: *Sämtliche Werke, vierter Band*. Ed. P. Deussen, München: R. Piper & Co., 1913.

Sextus Empiricus

Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes (= *Pyrrh. hyp.*), in: *Sexti Empirici Opera*, vol. 1. Ed. Hermann Mutschmann, Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

Stein, Edith

Aus dem Leben einer jüdischen Familie. Freiburg: Herder, 1965.

1.2 Psychology

Gibson, James Jerome

The Perception of the Visual World. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1950.

Šikl, Radovan

Zrakové vnímání. Praha: Grada Publishing, 2012.

2. Secondary sources

Allison, Henry Edward. *Kants' Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2004.

Ameriks, Karl. "Husserl's Realism", in: *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 86, No. 4, 1977, pp. 498-519.

Beiser, Frederick Charles. *German Idealism: The Struggle against Subjectivism 1781-1801*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press, 2002.

De Santis, Daniele. "Fourth Cartesian Meditation", in: De Santis, Daniele (ed.), *Husserl, The Cartesian Meditations. Commentary and Interpretation*. Berlin: De Gruyter, forthcoming 2022.

Kern, Iso. *Husserl und Kant: Eine Untersuchung über Husserls Verhältnis zu Kant und zum Neukantianismus*. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1964.

Mohanty, Jitendra Nath. "The Development of Husserl's Thought", in: *The Cambridge Companion to Husserl*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Pollok, Konstantin. "Die Göttinger Rezension", in: Kant, Immanuel. *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 2001.

Smith, Norman Kemp. "Kant's Relation to Berkeley", in: *A Commentary on Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. London: Macmillan, 1918, pp. 155-161.

Strasser, Stephan. "Einleitung", in: Husserl, Edmund. *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1950.

Strawson, Peter Frederick. *The Bounds of Sense: An Essay on Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. London: Methuen, 1966.

Turbayne, Colin Murray. "Kant's refutation of Dogmatic Idealism", in: *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 20, 1955, pp. 225-244.

Wilson, Margaret Dauler. "Kant and the 'Dogmatic Idealism of Berkeley'" (1971), in: *Ideas and Mechanism: Essays on Early Modern Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014, pp. 276-293