

UNITED WISDOM

Husserl: Returning to How Experience Is Given

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-19-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Husserl: Returning to How Experience Is Given

Imagine a hypothetical scene: you are waiting for a reply to an important message. Your phone lies on the table. On another evening it would be just an object; now it almost becomes the centre of the room. The screen's light seems a promise, silence a delayed answer, a familiar sound the possible beginning of a conversation. Nothing unusual may have happened to the phone itself. What changed is how it is present in your experience.

What do we mean by "I see the phone"? Am I seeing its surface, expecting a message, remembering yesterday's conversation, fearing a particular reply? These acts may intertwine, but they are not the same. Returning to experience begins with considering this distinction before explaining its cause or declaring the correct response.

What This Article Is About

Edmund Husserl's phenomenology investigates modes of givenness: how an object is perceived, remembered, expected, and meaningful to the person experiencing it. We will consider a small historical framework: intentionality, the natural attitude, epoché, temporal structure, and the distinction between one's own experience and another's. We will then offer hypothetical scenes and questions of our own. This is philosophical description, rather than clinical practice, neuroscientific research, or a promise of becoming calmer. Our examples are not attributed to Husserl. The article's central distinction is that attention to a mode of givenness neither cancels the world nor makes every interpretation true; it helps reveal which relation to an object already participates in the claim "I know what happened."

1. Experience Deserves a More Concrete Examination

Husserl describes the natural attitude as ordinary life in an already present world, where we perceive, judge, feel, and desire. Such a world does not begin with a philosophical proof before every action. Husserl, Ideas I, §27, excerpt translated by F. Kersten.

In our hypothetical scene, someone does not first seek grounds for the table's existence. They await a message. Objects are already arranged in relation to that expectation: the phone is nearby, other work seems temporarily pushed aside, minutes have a particular significance. This description neither establishes causes nor says the waiting is pathological. It makes the structure of one episode visible.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

We can begin with “What is wrong with me?” and immediately obtain a broad answer about personality. We can ask “How is this waiting structured now?” and discover a more definite object: a sound, a screen, an anticipated reply, the possibility of returning to other work. The second question need not replace the first forever, but prevents it from immediately swallowing the entire scene.

Description matters for its unhurried character. Calling the phone “a source of anxiety” already offers an explanation. Saying “Every sound is now perceived as a possible message” first names a feature of experience. The explanation may prove correct; it simply need not precede description.

Imagine another evening. The answer has arrived, and the phone is again used to search for an address. The same object participates in a different act. This does not prove that the physical world is created by intention. It shows why “I see the same object” does not exhaust how the object is encountered.

In our reading, returning to experience means reducing hasty generality. Instead of “I always live like this,” we say, “I am now awaiting this reply in this manner.” Episodes can later be compared. But comparison will rest on described differences, rather than one word immediately made a characteristic of an entire life.

2. Intentionality Is Not the Power of Desire

Intentionality designates experience’s directedness towards something. An academic account distinguishes what an act is directed towards from the character of that directedness—doubt, hope, or assertion, for example; one object can be given in different ways. Dan Zahavi, “Edmund Husserl,” §2.

Our contemporary example: thinking about tomorrow’s meeting may be an expectation, a memory of a similar meeting, a desire for agreement, or an attempt to determine a time. The object seems the same—the meeting. But what we are doing in experience differs. Calling all of this simply “a thought” is convenient, yet sometimes too coarse for our question.

“Intention” in ordinary speech can mislead. If someone fears refusal, this does not mean they deliberately want refusal or attract it. Directedness towards a possible event proves neither desire nor an ability to bring the event about. We preserve this distinction so that a philosophical term does not become an accusation for unpleasant experiences.

Imagine an imagined meeting becoming so detailed that someone already answers the other person’s anticipated objection. Such imagining may be useful preparation. But the other person has not yet spoken. Answering an imagined objection and answering actual words are different

events. If they are confused, the real conversation becomes the continuation of a story the second participant never began.

The reverse is possible too: someone imagines a favourable outcome and begins treating assent as already obtained. The object is present again, but in the mode of expectation. Even a very clear image is not equivalent to another person's message. A decision needs to preserve the image's status.

Our question about such an episode is "In what mode is this meeting now given?", rather than "Why did you make this up?" Am I remembering it? Anticipating it? Describing it from an invitation received? Already observing it? The answer helps determine which kind of check is possible.

Intentionality need not be a conscious project. We do not propose controlling every directedness or declaring it the result of free choice. Sometimes distinguishing an object from the mode of relation to it is enough. This very distinction prevents expectation from being taken as fact and fear as intention.

3. Epoché Does Not Require Destroying the World

In Ideas I, §31, Husserl describes putting the customary positing out of active use: a belief is not necessarily rejected or changed. Epoché alters the mode of consideration, rather than announcing that there is no world. Husserl, Ideas I, §31, Kersten, pp. 59–60.

A hypothetical cup is useful for our reading. Ordinarily you pick it up to drink. Now, for a minute, you consider how it is given: a visible side, a shadow, an assumed handle beyond the edge, a familiar purpose. You need not cease believing that the cup exists. The question directing attention has changed.

But this minute cannot be proclaimed a completed transcendental reduction. Our example is a small illustration of a change of subject. Husserl's philosophical project is considerably broader and requires its own argument. An everyday pause does not certify that the reader has already carried out the entire methodology.

For a message, we can temporarily stop using "This is a refusal" as a final explanation and examine how it was read. Which words were perceived? Where did expectation arise? Which continuation of the sentence was assumed? This question does not assert that no refusal occurred. It lets us avoid deciding the object in advance through the very conclusion we intend to investigate.

A pause risks becoming withdrawal from life: "I observe everything, so I do not participate." We do not propose this. If someone promised to answer, describing expectation does not

cancel the promise. If a message requires a decision, investigating givenness does not replace that decision. A philosophical change of question has a boundary within a particular task.

Another objection: can we really suspend every presupposition? Our contemporary exercise makes no such demand. We can notice one accepted conclusion and temporarily refrain from treating it as proven. Everything else remains a working background. This modest action preserves the possibility of correction without claiming a completely pure view.

Epoché thus does not become a magical button deleting the world, beliefs, or emotions. It helps pose a question about what was previously simply accepted. Our application is limited to this possibility of changing the object of attention.

4. The Visible Side and the Whole Object

An ordinary object is not given completely from every side at once; perception admits further confirmation and revision. Academic commentary connects givenness with evidence, distinguishing it from a mere feeling of confidence. Zahavi, §2, discussion of fulfilment and evidence.

Our cup is useful precisely because it is ordinary. You see part of its surface but deal with a whole cup. Turning it reveals another side. If it is cracked, the previous expectation of usability changes. We need not say there was initially only a patch and imagination arbitrarily manufactured an object afterwards. The object is already encountered as a definite thing with possibilities for further experience.

The example shows two kinds of incompleteness. I do not see the back now, but can change position. I may also have a mistaken expectation about what will be there. The first is not necessarily an error. The second is discovered in new experience. Not every absence of complete givenness makes knowledge useless.

In a hypothetical conversation we also possess a part: one phrase, one gesture, a particular moment. But the object model cannot automatically be transferred to a person’s inner world, as though walking around them would yield every motive. The analogy helps notice incompleteness; it does not promise to eliminate it finally.

Our question concerns scope: what exactly is given, and what has expectation added? “I heard a short answer” is one thing; “The conversation is over forever” is another. Additional words and circumstances may support the second. But brevity alone does not supply its grounds.

A positive claim also appears: “They smiled, so they agree.” The smile may indeed have been perceived, but assent needs its own object. If an obligation was being discussed, hearing a definite answer is more useful than expanding one side of the encounter into an entire decision.

In our reading, incomplete givenness invites clarification. It should neither devalue everything perceived nor allow gaps to be filled with any convenient meaning. The reader retains an encounter with the object and the possibility of a new encounter that confirms, clarifies, or changes the previous understanding.

Another distinction appears in our contemporary address scene. You read a message: “Meet at the blue door.” Its meaning is clear, and you can repeat the instruction. Yet the door is not yet given as it will be when you approach the building. Understanding a sign about an object and encountering the object are different relations to it. One can direct the other without replacing it entirely.

Suppose the building has two blue doors. The instruction now needs clarification. This does not mean the message had no meaning. It successfully identified colour and object type while leaving the location open. A new encounter with the setting reveals which part of the meaning already did its work and which has not yet gained enough definition. We offer this example as our own explanation, rather than retelling a scene from Husserl’s writings.

There is another possibility. The door is found but locked. Perception confirms its location without confirming access. If you previously included an unsupported promise of “It will be easy to enter” in the instruction, that promise does not become part of the door you see. Confirmation always has an object: what exactly was confirmed? Appearance, address, suitability for action, agreement to meet you? All these questions may concern one situation while retaining different requirements for an answer.

Phenomenological attentiveness in our reading therefore does not reduce to more vivid impressions. You can see the door very clearly and still not know where the meeting will happen. You can receive a short clarification and sufficiently understand the route although the new object is not yet visible. We establish no general superiority of visual experience over words. We distinguish how words, expectation, and perception participate in this knowledge. That distinction preserves each mode’s value without assigning it the powers of the others.

5. The Present Is Not a Motionless Point

Husserl’s analysis of time distinguishes primal impression, retention of what has just passed, and protention of what comes next. Retention differs from a separate memory of a past event; protention from a distinct distant plan. Zahavi, §4, analysis of temporal experience.

For our contemporary example, take a short sentence. At its end, you still understand its beginning. If each sound vanished completely from experience as the next arrived, a coherent sentence would not have its familiar form. Yet the beginning is not sounding simultaneously with the last word. It has a different mode of presence.

Now imagine the other person beginning “I agree, but…” An expectation of continuation arises before completion. If what follows differs from what was expected, surprise becomes possible. This hypothetical example does not prove the entire theory of time; it helps us notice that a conversation’s “now” includes directedness towards what was just said and what comes next.

This distinction matters for the opening scene. Someone sees the phone now, but that present moment is not isolated from the sent message and expected reply. Describing expectation cannot be reduced to a photograph of the room. The objects appear in the picture, but the structure of the experienced delay remains unexpressed.

We can imagine two intervals of equal duration. In one, you listen to someone finishing an important answer; in the other, you wait to see whether a conversation will begin at all. Time’s significance differs. But this does not mean clocks cease to have a shared object. Again, we distinguish measured duration from the way a sequence is experienced.

There is a danger of reading this topic as an appeal to “Live only in the present” and delete past and future. Our illustration does not support that simplification. The coherence of current experience requires relations to what has just passed and what is expected. We need not simultaneously make distant plans, but the present does not appear as a point stripped of all connections either.

Attending to temporal structure lets us describe a difficulty more precisely: I am awaiting a reply, returning to a past phrase, preparing an objection, or actually hearing the current continuation. Sometimes these acts intertwine. Naming their distinction already reveals more than “I am here” can show alone.

6. Another Person Is Given Differently From a Thing

An academic account of Husserl stresses the asymmetry between one’s own experience and another’s: another person’s experience is not given to us in its original first-person form. Partial access preserves precisely the other, rather than a copy of our own consciousness. Zahavi, §5, intersubjectivity.

Our hypothetical example: you see someone fall silent after a certain phrase. You can ask what happened or suggest an explanation. But you cannot simply transfer your own familiar experience of silence: “If I fell silent like that, I would be hurt; therefore they are hurt.” This is a permissible hypothesis, rather than direct possession of another’s experience.

The limit does not make understanding impossible. People communicate, answer, clarify, and address a conversation’s object together. The other person may say they were thinking, failed

to hear, or do not wish to discuss the subject. Their answer adds information. It need not match the observer's first explanation.

A harder possibility should also remain: the answer does not provide complete clarity. Someone may choose a brief formulation, struggle, or refuse. We gain no automatic right to fill the unknown. Sometimes a shared task requires agreeing on an action, rather than revealing all the inner content.

In our interpretation, respect for another's givenness shows in the form of questions. "Do you not want to continue now?" allows them to define their participation. "You are hiding hurt; I can see it" already presents an answer as fact. The first sentence may also be inappropriate; its significance depends on circumstances. But the distinction between claims remains.

The reverse problem exists too: someone declares that because another's experience is never fully accessible, nothing the other says matters. Partiality becomes complete distrust. Our reading does not require this. We can consider messages, notice consistency in action, and retain definite unknowns. Complete possession is not a condition of every understanding.

The other remains a source of correction to our picture. Their perspective can change the shared object: what we considered a simple delay proved for them a difficulty of access. This does not automatically prove them right about everything. It makes the conversation more shared because both participants are present, rather than only one observer and their explanation.

7. Description, Explanation, and Intervention

Examining experience does not yet determine its cause. Naming a cause does not yet choose an action. Choosing an action does not yet check its result. These are our contemporary distinctions, helping prevent phenomenological attention from replacing everything else.

Imagine someone noticing that the screen is now given primarily as an opportunity to receive approval. This description may be accurate for them. It neither proves expectation's origin nor defines their personality nor requires turning off the phone. The next decision depends on the task: awaiting important information, returning to work, ending the wait, or clarifying an agreement.

One may object that description itself changes experience. Once we look attentively at waiting, it is no longer what it was a minute ago. In Ideas I, §77, Husserl considers reflection and how a previously unnoticed experience becomes an object of attention. Husserl, Ideas I, §77, Kersten, pp. 174–175. Our discussion does not resolve the entire problem of reflection's reliability, but does not conceal it.

Preserving the time of description therefore helps. “While waiting, it seemed to me…” and “Now, describing the wait, I see…” are not necessarily equivalent evidence. Sometimes the difference matters: new information has already changed a previous message’s meaning. We can reconstruct an account without presenting it as an unchanged snapshot of the original minute.

Another boundary concerns obligations. If someone needs to send confirmation, a long analysis of directedness may distract from a simple action. If understanding an experience is needed, a quick prescription may obstruct that understanding. Purpose determines the appropriate move, rather than the prestige of a philosophical word.

Our application does not declare attention a treatment either. The article contains no verification that this reflection reduces a particular condition or suits everyone. Readers may find the distinction useful, neutral, or tiring. No response is an examination of their aptitude for phenomenology.

Description is valuable when it allows a more precise view of its object. If it merely multiplies complicated names instead, we can return to a simple phrase: what is happening for me now, what am I assuming, and what have I not yet encountered in experience? A good question needs no constant display of terminological complexity.

8. What This Means in Practice

If you want to try a limited reflection, choose a small episode: waiting for a message, looking at a familiar object, reading a short phrase. A difficult situation need not come first. The exercise is voluntary and does not count as carrying out Husserl’s entire methodology.

First, describe what attention is directed towards. Then clarify the mode: am I perceiving, remembering, expecting, imagining, evaluating? Several answers are possible. For example: “I see the screen and imagine a refusal appearing on it.” A separate note already shows that the visible screen and anticipated refusal have different givenness.

Then you can ask what was actually encountered in experience. Was a text received? Which phrase was spoken? What was added without another person’s message? Something added need not be rejected simply because it is an expectation. It may be reasonable. Its status should be preserved so that a future answer can change the picture.

The next question is where the limit lies. An object has an invisible side, a message an unclarified meaning, another person their own experience. These kinds of incompleteness differ. An object can be turned. A meaning can sometimes be clarified. Another’s experience does not become ours even after a good conversation.

If reflection concerns a shared situation, a small question allowing correction is possible: “I understood this as a refusal; is that right?” If an answer is unavailable, uncertainty can remain while you decide which action matches the information actually received. No preliminary explanation of the other person’s entire inner world is required.

Ending the note without a large conclusion about personality helps. “I discovered I was already answering an imagined objection” is a sufficiently definite result. You can then return to the actual message or await a reply. This is a small distinction, rather than a proclaimed ultimate transformation.

If attention to experience increases confusion, it can be stopped. Sometimes clarifying the conversation’s object or performing a necessary action is more convenient. Philosophical practice should not become another demand we must meet before earning the right to live an ordinary life.

9. Returning to the World With a More Precise Question

At the beginning, the phone seemed to occupy the room’s centre. After reflection, it need not immediately return to its ordinary place. Waiting may continue. Something else changed: the person distinguished the screen, a possible answer, and their own anticipation. Each part of experience need no longer be treated as one proven event.

When a message arrives, a new givenness emerges. It may confirm expectation, change it, or pose another question. If no message arrives, the fact of no reply by a particular time remains, along with a motive still unestablished. The reader may decide without eliminating that difference.

Phenomenology does not oblige us to turn away from the external world towards an inner spectacle. Its question concerns how the world is encountered and meaningful. In our contemporary interpretation, this helps restore details that disappeared behind an early general explanation.

Yet we do not declare Husserl’s philosophy mere attention. His system includes a broader transcendental project, and its complex propositions remain disputed. We have considered particular distinctions on the basis of read excerpts and academic commentary. A practical illustration does not equal proof of the system.

For an everyday reader, a question remains that can be carried along without a compulsory ritual: what exactly is given to me now, and in which mode? It does not promise to establish truth immediately, but reveals when memory is presented as current observation, expectation as fact, and understanding another as complete possession of their experience.

Sometimes returning to experience makes an answer smaller and more precise. Not “I understood everything,” but “I saw one transition.” Not a final formula of a person, but a chance to hear their correction. Not a pure world without conditions, but a more attentive encounter with what is actually present and what is still only expected.

Sources

1. Edmund Husserl. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book*, translated by F. Kersten, 1983: §§27, 31, 77. University College London teaching excerpts. Excerpts were read, rather than the whole volume.

2. Dan Zahavi. *Edmund Husserl*, §§2–5: intentionality, reduction, temporal experience, intersubjectivity. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, current 2025 revision.