

Phil 190: First Response/Analysis Paper, Group IV
Fall, 2015

Instructions

Note: this assignment is for students in Group IV *only*.

The assignment is due, as an attachment, via the “Assignments” tool on eCommons, by midnight Thursday, October 29 (in PDF or any format easily converted to PDF, e.g. MSWord, L^AT_EX, RTF, plain text).

Please respond to the following question in approximately two pages (double spaced). (Needless to say this should be your own original work.)

In the third paragraph of §20 of the Fifth Logical Investigation (in last week’s reading), Husserl says that it is not exactly the same for two acts to have the “same content” — that is, the same matter — as it is for them to have the same “intentional object”: sometimes two acts will have the same intentional object, but nevertheless differ in content/matter. Based on the reason he gives there, how might he have wanted to modify that conclusion later? See especially *Ideas* §§88 and 89. In what sense does having the same “noematic” object indeed mean having the same content (same “matter,” in the sense of the *Logical Investigations*)? What has changed in between?