

**Philosophy 190E**  
**Response/Analysis Paper 3**

**Instructions**

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

The assignment is due Thurs., Feb. 3.

Please submit by e-mail to me.

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 acts' having the "same content" — that is, the same matter — can't be reduced to their having the same "intentional object." 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?