

UNITED WISDOM

Body and environment in Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-09-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Body and environment in Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology

Epigraph

> *The world is not what I think, but what I live through.*

Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Phenomenology of Perception, Preface, p. xviii, complete sentence, Colin Smith translation.

What this article is about

In a familiar reading room, a table can appear as a place for a book, a chair as somewhere to sit, and an aisle as a way to a shelf. Distances can be measured, yet measurement does not describe how space is available to a particular person with a purpose. Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology raises the question of the body through which a world is lived and becomes a place of action. We read selected passages of the Colin Smith translation of Phenomenology of Perception and make a limited comparison with James’s historical argument about habit. Our main analysis is original: what changes when someone carries a bag, seeks a book, recognises an arrangement, or encounters an obstacle? Philosophical description establishes no neural mechanism, makes no feeling infallible, and requires no special bodily practice. It helps identify relations among an object, a possibility of action, and a situation.

I. The body described and the body through which one acts

A body can be described from outside: height, hand position, distance to a table. In our invented case, someone enters a reading room holding a bag and intending to find a book. Their hand is not merely an object of a certain length. It is occupied by the bag, can be freed, reach towards a table, or open a fastening. This description includes possibilities related to a purpose. It does not deny external measurement; it asks another question about the same situation. Arm length remains measurable, but knowing it establishes neither a free palm, a suitable place for the bag, nor permission to put belongings on a visible surface.

In the selected Merleau-Ponty passages, bodily existence concerns a lived world and action, while habit concerns acquiring movement’s and an instrument’s significance. We use those questions within the pages read, without surveying the author’s entire philosophy. This is a philosophical argument rather than a contemporary test of learning speed or nervous processes. ‘The body understands’ will therefore concern an account of available action. It names no separate thinker inside a hand, and licenses no attribution of an intention someone

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

has not expressed. Our ensuing scene explores the distinction on its own terms rather than presenting every detail as a claim made by the philosopher.

An observer saying ‘the hand is near the table’ may describe position correctly. The person saying ‘I cannot take the book yet’ is not refuted by proximity alone. The book might be under the bag, covered by a transparent lid, or part of another task. Understanding the action requires identifying the object and what ‘take’ means here. Hand condition, object position, and an available transition are related without being identical. Our example explores that relation without making an external view useless or immediate feeling superior to every document. Each description can provide content the other lacks, and disagreement can arise because they answer different questions.

II. Nearby and accessible are different features

Let the book be only a few steps from the entrance, with a trolley placed between door and table. This is a condition of our invented scene rather than an observation of an actual library. Geometrical distance can remain unchanged while the route requires a detour. A visible item behind glass likewise need not be touchable. Select the spatial question: where is the object, how is it seen, or how can it be reached? One answer may support another without replacing it. Clarification changes no room dimensions. It changes the relation being described between person and thing, making a formerly vague claim of closeness more specific.

‘There is enough space here’ also needs an object. Enough for a person without a bag, for turning with a large item, or for another visitor to pass? In our case, the bag enlarges the space relevant to a turn. This is conditional reasoning about a specified arrangement, without a universal aisle standard or safety design recommendation. Actual dimensions and applicable requirements need separate checks when relevant. The phenomenological question draws attention to space being described in relation to a possible action. Naming that action and object makes discussion more definite without converting a feeling of convenience into a numerical standard or permission to obstruct others.

Suppose the person first seeks a place for the bag and then a place to read. One surface can suit the first action and not the second: a low stand accommodates a bag but is awkward for reading. ‘Suitable’ is not one general property identical across every use. It concerns a selected activity, without implying that desire creates the thing. The stand retains its height and shape; different possibilities of those properties appear across tasks. Separating properties from use explains a changed assessment without making the object physically different in the minute between questions. What altered is the role of an unchanged surface within the person’s practical situation.

III. A purpose changes the surroundings’ significance

When seeking a book, titles on spines may be the shelf’s relevant feature. When seeking somewhere for a bag, an available surface and permitted use matter. This distinction belongs to our case, without proving attention always obeys intention. Someone can miss the title or become distracted. Naming the purpose nevertheless explains why one thing is discussed through text and another through support. The surroundings are not described as a random collection of sensations to which an unrelated undertaking is later attached. In this scene, someone is already among things while trying to do something particular, and the question arises within that situation rather than outside every practical relation.

Seeking a particular book differs from freely choosing something to read. In the first case, a matching title and author permit checking the edition. In the second, a cover or familiar theme may invite stopping. Neither approach becomes more reasonable merely by having a stricter criterion. Different tasks allow different endings. Naming the present search criterion explains what happened without prescribing a correct purpose or making reading follow a predetermined procedure. Our analysis distinguishes the relation already specified by a question from choices still open. The same shelf can participate in those different activities while its physical contents remain unchanged and available for later description.

A changed purpose can make familiar surroundings newly relevant. Having found the book, the person seeks light suitable for reading its page. A lamp formerly noticed as part of the decor gains a specified role. If it does not switch on, its current role changes again: a visible lamp is not yet an available light source. Identify the thing separately from using it now. In our example, the object’s name guarantees no result. The environmental account becomes more precise without a complex inference about hidden psychology: we know the intended activity, selected object, and transition that did not occur. A failed action gives another question about the situation rather than a verdict on the person.

IV. Familiar action and a new situation

The person may have entered many times and placed the bag on one stand. In our invented scene, a familiar movement begins before they notice the stand has moved. This is no research finding or diagnosis of absent-mindedness. We specify a case in which a familiar direction no longer leads to the former object. The mismatch between action and setting can be described without explaining neuronal organisation. This transition needs pausing and the changed arrangement needs seeing. The former movement’s familiarity does not make it bad; it relates to conditions that have changed on this occasion and now need clarification. The scene establishes no frequency or prevalence of such mismatches.

A new arrangement can be learned in words: ‘the stand is now by the window’. Verbal knowledge and comfortable use need not emerge at one moment. Someone can repeat the location correctly while retaining the bag in the other hand and choosing a route around a chair. Slower action alone establishes no misunderstood message. In our example, position, occupied hand, and selected route need relating. The statement already directs a search towards the window while the particular transition is still being arranged. This describes the situation without demanding speed or assuming that an understood word must instantly produce the same movement in everyone. Different bodily circumstances can accompany the same accurately understood description.

Successful familiar portions can remain. Knowing how to open the bag and find the recorded title is not cancelled by moving the stand. One changed condition does not invalidate every acquired capacity. Our scene can identify what depended on the former location and what concerns the bag or note itself. This analyses relations, without promising rapid relearning. Some changes may need substantial time, assistance, or another arrangement. The limited example sets no adaptation norm and does not turn the capacity to describe a correction into an obligation to manage immediately without support. Knowing which part changed can help formulate a question while leaving the required means of action genuinely unresolved.

V. An instrument in relation to the world

In Merleau-Ponty’s selected account, a stick appears as an instrument of perception rather than solely an object inspected separately; familiar use concerns a field of action. This is philosophy, without mobility instruction or a contemporary study of all cane users. Our original case uses another item: a bookmark retaining a place. Inspecting it makes shape and inscription relevant; marking a page makes it part of returning to text. These uses differ. The instrument does not physically disappear when its own properties cease to be the main focus, and it does not merge with human consciousness. A changing role is distinct from a changed material identity.

A bookmark has a clear limit. It marks a page without reporting which thought was last understood or accepted. Two people can stop on one page with different questions. A question needing retention can be recorded separately. The instrument’s significance concerns what it actually enables in our scene. Calling it ‘the book’s memory’ may be a convenient metaphor, but expands no function. After a pause, the mark helps locate a place; the earlier reflection is not fully recovered merely because the page opens correctly and the object remains between the same leaves. Locating a passage and resuming an understanding are related tasks with distinct content and possible outcomes.

If the bookmark falls out, a chapter title or note can be consulted without declaring the entire reading experience lost. Different means retain different features: page, topic, question, date.

Comparing them permits continuing a bounded activity when one item no longer performs its former role. This is our example rather than a tested memory-improvement method. It shows that relations among body, thing, and task are not exhausted by an instrument’s proximity. Identify its use and the result it denotes. The person can abandon that means and read differently while preserving a purpose, without having to incorporate every object into a bodily habit or regard a changed preference as failed perception.

VI. The environment does not coincide with desire

The person can expect a lamp to switch on, yet its switch produces no light. The purpose remains intelligible while the object fails to perform as expected. A lived possibility need not be realised. A particular condition needs identifying: is the lamp connected, is another source available, can another seat be chosen? We offer no technical device diagnosis. The issue is a transition between expectation and an actually available result. Intending to read creates no illumination, just as recognising a lamp proves no working condition. The environment here has properties capable of limiting action independently of confidence. An account of experience therefore need not erase resistance or make objects obey interpretation.

Keeping resistance visible also matters in describing space. A route may feel short, yet end at a locked door. Shortness concerns an earlier expectation or visible distance; closure concerns current access. Both statements can be true within their scope. Rather than disputing whether the room is generally convenient, name a relation: the selected route is closed now, another remains unchecked. This preserves experience without making it reality’s final measure. It moves from a broad impression to a concrete question, keeping an unknown part unknown until suitable information or another available means is obtained. Neither disappointment nor a confident prediction supplies the missing facts about the alternative route.

In this account, the world is neither a pure projection of thought nor a list of things unrelated to action. The conditional scene includes object properties, a purpose, and a means of use. Shelf height limits access; a question about a needed book determines why this shelf currently matters. Checking a title may require only a catalogue entry, whereas reading pages needs another kind of access. An alternative depends on the task’s content rather than an assumed requirement to retrieve everything with one’s own hand. Continuing differently or stopping need not make an encountered limit a verdict on personal adequacy. The object can remain important while the chosen route towards it changes.

VII. Familiarity does not guarantee a fitting action

James’s historical habit chapter discusses actions requiring less conscious attention and notes that familiar action can misfit a changed situation. This is a limited comparison of descriptions rather than a contemporary test of every movement. We do not adopt adjacent physiological schemes or disease discussions as present facts. Our scene asks about the conditions of familiar action. A visitor approaches the former table while the needed book now occupies another shelf. An old route and a new purpose can be recognised together without making past experience necessarily harmful. The mismatch concerns this route and the object sought now, not a general defect in the person or in acquired familiarity.

Finding a mistaken route may permit a small correction: return to the appropriate shelf while retaining the title. That proves no ease of changing every habit. The conditions of our case allow this transition; other circumstances can differ. Ordinary observation should acquire no promise of rapidly changing character or a way of life. The more specific question is which element no longer fits the object. Identifying it permits selecting a check. If the book’s location is unknown, a catalogue or staff question helps identify it; concentrating harder on the old route does not make that route correct for a new purpose. Effort and relevant information have different roles in the repair.

Successful familiar action also need not come with a detailed verbal report. Someone opens a bag but cannot immediately describe which hand usually holds the fastening. This is a possible case rather than diagnosis or a memory test. The absence of a ready description does not prove an absence of skill. Conversely, describing a sequence well demonstrates no performance under every condition. Words, movement, and result have different checks. A report can be clarified or an available action considered when voluntary and appropriate. Nobody must demonstrate a habit to have their experience acknowledged. Unchecked details may stay open without turning uncertainty into disbelief or treating verbal fluency as a complete measure of practical ability.

VIII. The same room for another person

Another visitor can be at the same table reading another book with another purpose. The free surface serves note-taking while the first person seeks a place for a bag. The object is shared; relations to it differ. Agreeing on use can begin by naming the needed action and available space. Two experiences need not be incompatible because ‘convenient’ denotes different features. Our example permits different purposes without claiming full knowledge of another’s experience. Proximity gives no automatic shared view of a room: another person’s expressed intention becomes known through words and actions. A common setting can support a question about coordination without erasing the difference between its participants.

My ability to read small print from a selected distance does not establish another person’s equal access. Ask about a suitable presentation without determining the difference’s cause or attributing a health condition. Our scene needs only an offer of closer text, spoken clarification, or another available format chosen by the person. This is conditional reasoning about reading together rather than medical advice. A common thing requires no identical bodily relation to it. Agreeing a means retains the conversational object, while respecting the response preserves choice and the right not to explain personal circumstances. The offered alternative remains an option rather than an obligation to compensate for someone else’s assumption.

Choosing to hear a page described does not supply every feature of direct reading. A description can communicate a sentence without preserving typeface, arrangement, or illustration. When arrangement matters, identify it separately through an available means. The difference creates no hierarchy of human worth. We compare access to a specified feature. A participant may report sufficient content for their question or ask for another representation. Understanding the conversational object requires no appropriation of someone else’s mode of perception. Retain what was conveyed and which aspect remains outside the selected representation. Access can be adequate for one purpose while another question needs a different form of detail.

IX. Describing experience and explaining a mechanism

We can describe someone immediately approaching a particular shelf in a familiar room. Explaining how the capacity developed or which processes accompanied the action needs other grounds. One room narrative contains no brain measurements. A selected philosophical text does not become such a measurement by describing a situation precisely. This article therefore distinguishes a historical argument, an original scene, and a mechanism claim not made here. Description remains usable for its purpose: making relations among goal, object, and movement visible without simultaneously proving the origin of every element. The explanatory question is preserved rather than answered by a borrowed philosophical term or an invented scientific label.

Description and research need not conflict. A study of a specified movement and conditions could be compared with an appropriate question. First identify participants, task, measured outcome, and inference limits. We report no such contemporary study here. Historical patient examples and earlier physiology remain context within philosophical and psychological texts. They become neither diagnosis of a reader nor a universal account of a mistaken route. Missing data are not supplied by a familiar-sounding story. Recognisability and empirical support have different grounds. Preserving that distinction allows the scene to remain meaningful while a scientific question stays unanswered rather than being obscured by confidence in the narrative.

The proposed observation has the same limit. Considering a book’s position and naming an available action accomplishes that small analysis. We assert no subsequent improvement in attention, memory, or well-being. Such outcomes would require separate criteria and checks. A useful distinction can be noticed without attaching measured consequences to it. The exercise therefore specifies an object, question, and means of access. If it does not suit the situation, an imagined case or no exercise is acceptable. Philosophical reading creates no duty to monitor the body constantly, control every movement, or seek concealed meaning in each sensation. Its question can be retained without converting ordinary activity into continuous self-examination.

X. Body and environment within one action

In our scene, ‘finding a book’ is exhausted neither by an inner decision nor by a volume’s shelf position. A person has a purpose, an available route, an identified edition, means of reading, and actual limits. Different descriptions expose different relations within the action. A room plan supplies location, a catalogue an edition record, movement an available transition, and words a selected question. One description need not replace all others. Identify where each supplies content and what remains open. Body–environment relations then become an object of concrete reasoning rather than a general assertion that everything connects with everything. The action can be understood through specified relations while other questions retain independent significance.

The body is not added to an already completed thought as a late delivery device. ‘Can I take this book?’ already includes position, availability, and possible use. The thing also does not dissolve into experience: location, shape, and properties can fail to meet expectation. Both sides remain in our scene. A relation does not make person and environment identical. An action’s possibility concerns a particular relation and can change with the object’s position, a purpose, or another means. These changes have different specified reasons, so one word such as ‘attitude’ should not assign them all to an internal state. The account retains material conditions alongside the person’s expressed undertaking.

The analysis can close by describing what was achieved. The person identifies the edition and location without yet gaining access to pages. Or opens the volume without deciding whether its content answers the question. These are different results. Bodily access guarantees no textual understanding; understanding a title completes no retrieval. Keeping those distinctions allows reading the philosophical idea of a lived world without a promise of infallibility. We remain among things that can be sought, used, clarified, or left; action has grounds and limits. In this bounded sense, body and environment are considered together while the person retains a choice about what follows and whether any further step is wanted.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary object already available in a comfortable situation: a book, cup, or sheet. Remaining still and considering it mentally is enough; no movement or change of sensation is required. Name one question about it: where it is, what needs seeing, or which use you are considering. If a real case does not suit you, use this article’s invented reading room. The example needs no physical performance to be discussed.

Distinguish an object property, your current purpose, and an available means. For example: the book is on a table; you need its author; the cover can supply the name. Covered text creates a separate access condition rather than proving insufficient attention. Attempt no uncomfortable or unwanted transition for the exercise. Missing information can be identified and left open without treating that state as a failed result.

Change only the question in imagination. Finding the author may need a cover, reading a chapter needs pages, and comparing editions needs other features. Identify what changed in significance and what remained an object property. End with one statement about the relation actually considered. This original voluntary practice has not been validated for improving memory, attention, or well-being. Its purpose is distinguishing questions and grounds within one bounded case, without bodily control, medical conclusions, or a requirement to monitor your own movements constantly. Continuing the reflection is optional.

Key quotation

> *The body is our general medium for having a world.*

Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Phenomenology of Perception, Part I, Chapter 3, p. 169, complete sentence, Colin Smith translation; printed line wrap normalised.

Connections between traditions

1. **Merleau-Ponty, Preface / original case:** a lived world raises a relation question without making an expected lamp a fact of working condition.

2. **Merleau-Ponty, spatiality / geometry:** object position and available use answer different questions in the reading room.

3. **Merleau-Ponty, instrument / bookmark:** the philosophical instrument account meets our example of limited function; a bookmark retains no entire reading experience.

4. **James / Merleau-Ponty:** historical accounts of familiar action offer different questions without forming a contemporary neural mechanism.

5. **Both authors / practice:** original analysis of thing, purpose, and access keeps source limits and becomes no tested memory or attention intervention.

Primary sources

1. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Phenomenology of Perception, Colin Smith translation: selected Preface pp. xvii–xix, Part I Chapter 3 pp. 162–170, and Chapter 4 pp. 174–176; exact sentence and edition paths identified.

2. William James, The Principles of Psychology (1890), Chapter IV, Habit: selected historical descriptions of attention and action–situation mismatch; physiology is not adopted as present fact.

Tags

Merleau-Ponty, phenomenology, body, environment, perception, space, action, habit, instrument, experience, Colin Smith, James, reading room, object, access, purpose, distance, movement, book, bookmark, description, mechanism, limits, choice, understanding, attention, geometry, perspective, practice, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.