The un-conscious has imposed itself as one of the most significant ideas of contemporary thought. One may say that the main stream of the XX century philosophical discussion is concentrated on the critique of the idea of consciousness, of the self-conscious subject. But what do we have in mind, when we think and say un-conscious? For the greatest number of thinkers the un-conscious is synonymous to unconsciousness, Freudian unconsciousness. Nevertheless, important philosophical apories are connected with this notion of the un-conscious. What is the ontological and epistemological status of phenomenon, of an idea or of a representation, when it is unconscious? What link is possible between the unconscious and conscience? The causal one? And if so, where is the place for the free will, if our conscience is causally determined by the unconscious?

Paul Ricoeur pointed out basic contradictions that are inherent in the classic concept of the unconscious. The first question he asked was what kind of being is the object of the unconscious? Does the phenomenon of a trauma exist in the unconscious in a similar manner as its image of which we become aware of at the time of analysis? If so, then does it mean that we have two “fields of consciousness,” except that one of them is inaccessible? The foregoing reasoning has resulted in all “philosophies of suspicion” and the notions of true and false consciousness which are related to them.

Now the second, absolutely fundamental question needs to be addressed. How are we to interpret the transformation of driving energy into meaning? How can we cross the ontological border between the order of beings and the order of meanings?

We will try to examine, if there is a possibility of redefining the notion of the unconscious, starting from the strongest theory of conscious experience, from Husserls
phenomenology. For this, we have to ask if Husserls presumptions, concerning the area of consciousness, are defensible. We will concentrate on Husserls early work, "Logical Investigations", where his program is most clearly and strongly formulated.

We will argue that, in his fundamental, Cartesian thesis about the identical way of experiencing a phenomenon and an intentional act - as this phenomenon's foundation - Husserl slightly moved the limit of the consciousness, the limit between the present and the un-present. The intimacy of the phenomenon and the intentional act is strongly suggestive, and can easily be interpreted as an identity. Husserl exploited this similitude, but he himself was aware of the difference. He wrote, that when the light of our consciousness tends on the intentional act, the nature of the act changes in a fundamental and irreversible way. We may use as the model of this change suppositio materialis, mentioned by Husserl in his fourth investigation, a scholastic construction describing the way, in which the status (and the sense) of a proposition changes when it is simply stated, or it is stated as stated. The intentional act is not present for our conscious intuition, it is un-conscious. It is an un-conscious condition of conscious thinking.

If the intention is always unconscious how can we speak about it? The answer is, that to describe it, we always use a philosophical metaphor, as Hannah Arendt discussed in her work on thinking. What kind of metaphor has Husserl in mind, when he says "intention"? We will find that he uses three types of metaphors: the “ray of light”, “taking aim at something” and an “empty place”. We will argue, that the metaphor of void, of emptiness is the most adequate and the most fertile, because it opens the way to redefine the notion of the unconsciousness - the un-conscious as the intentional space.

We distinguish between the notions of unconsciousness and of what is not conscious. The former has already been defined and its present meaning has been mainly developed by psychoanalysis. Each time we wish to refer to this particular tradition, we shall use the term of “unconsciousness”. Whereas each time we wish to signal a different meaning stemming from the phenomenological tradition, we shall be using the term of “not conscious” or “what is not conscious”.

1 Paul Ricoeur, “De l’interpretation”, Paris 1965
1. A BORDER OF THE CONSCIOUS IN THE EXAMINATION OF AN INTENTIONAL ACT

Let us first start with a question whether consciousness may exist without the unconscious? Or otherwise, whether it is possible to develop a theory of consciousness without taking into account what is not conscious?

It is with dogmatic certainty that Husserl assumes that an intention - an act - is a necessary condition of being conscious of anything. Although this idea is, indeed, striking in its obviousness, it is not, however, an “intuitive” truth. This has been rightly pointed out by Natorp whose critique is quoted by Husserl in his “Investigation” Five. Natorp simply discarded the notion of intentional acts when he wrote:

“... I can deal with a tone by itself or in relation to other contents of consciousness, without also paying regard to its being for an ego, but I cannot deal with myself and my hearing by themselves, without thinking of the tone.” And Further on: “If anyone can catch his consciousness in anything else than the existence of a content for him, I am unable to follow him.”

It looks that what is most essential to us in this argument is: I have a sound in my consciousness, but I do not have an “act”. Husserl responds to that:

“Hearing certainly cannot be torn out of the hearing of a tone, as if it were something part from the tone it hears. But this does not mean that two things are not to be distinguished: the tone heard, the object of perception, and the hearing of the tone, the perceptual act.” [564] And further on: “… I also regard it as relevantly evident, … that there are different ‘manners of consciousness’, different intentional relations to objects, which are specifically different; […] Each logically distinct way of entertaining an object in thought corresponds to a difference in intention. To me it seems irrefragable that we only know of such differences because we envisage them in particular cases […] and can thus make them into objects of varying acts of intuition and thought.”
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2 P. Natorp, *Einleitung in die Psychologie*, p. 18
4 Op. Cit. P.568
The assertion made by Husserl makes it necessary to stop over the very notion of intuition. What does it mean that something is intuitive? How do we intuitively perceive any forms of intentional references to an object in particular case? The answer to those questions will take a major part of our analysis. Let us assume, to begin with, that intuitive is what appears in a specific moment, what is visible directly and clearly (visible - as the reference to our sight will turn out to be significant later on), and finally, what makes a coherent and closed figure. This understanding of intuition will be confronted with a thesis that manners of consciousness and acts are intuitive. And then we shall analyse the above definition of intuition.

While the ability to distinguish “manners of consciousness” is relevantly evident, one can hardly agree with Husserl that we envisage them in particular cases and we can grasp them directly. I am conscious - in the sense defined above - only of a tone, whereas I am not conscious of the act of hearing the tone. I can only infer it following this underlying reasoning: if there is a sound, so there is also something which can perceive that sound, and this is consciousness, and the perception of the sound is an act of consciousness. I can make an effort to turn this act into an object of consciousness. But will it be identical with what it was when I was perceiving the sound? At this point we come to face a trap - once it is overlooked one needs to recognise the intuitive property of the entire intentional sphere.

If I see a couple in love, then what appears in my intuition is something of this sort: “Oh, lovers.” The relation of “being in love”, separated from the people I see, it is already a product of conceptual analysis and it needs to be made into an object in a separate act of “being in love”. As A. Półtawski puts it:

“In order to recognise a conceptual approach to reality as genuine perception, and while he accepting the postulate of empiricism, and by demanding that all cognition be rooted in primary experience, Husserl extends the notion of intuition by adopting a peculiar categorial intuition. He must, however, solely rely on acts and their configurations as he cannot root it in sensations as a finite material. So the end product is merely a quasi-intuition.”

Husserl has moved the borders of our direct, intuitive perception towards what is not intuitive - towards acts, categories and ideal meanings. He goes, however, even further than this.
He declares that in spite of essential differences, the manner of existence of acts has one common trait with the manner of existence of phenomena - the ability to become an object of consciousness. Consciousness may turn its “eyes” on the act itself, as if it were any other object.

It seems that the founder of phenomenology follows here the reasoning of Descartes which he earlier criticised. As Husserl puts it in “The Crisis”\(^6\), the only dogmatic truth, which is intuitively grasped, which cannot be questioned in the assertion *cogito, ergo sum*, is *cogito*. *Sum*, a recognition of substantive existence of I, ego, is, in fact, a psychological hypostasis. Descartes left I, ego, as a natural *residuum* of the notion of the soul, and as such it was a breakthrough in *epoche*\(^7\). What is important in Husserl’s criticism from our point of view is that, even though Descartes derives the existence of a subject indirectly from the existence of *cognitiones*, he accepts it as a dogmatic and directly available truth, the truth about the existence. In our view the same holds for Husserl’s phenomenon and act.

The scholastic notion of an intentional act was taken by Husserl from Brentano, who said:

> “Each mental phenomenon contains something as object in itself, though not all in the same manner.”\(^8\)

From the above two assertions - that every consciousness is a consciousness of something and that this something may exist in various manners - it is indirectly concluded that those different manners stand for different acts of consciousness, and a conclusion is drawn- again indirectly - about the existence of acts which need to carry this something, grasp it, constitute and fill it with sense. But intuitively only this “something” is given, a phenomenon. Accordingly, Husserl derives the existence of acts from the existence of phenomena, and then puts on one plain two manners of existence - phenomena and acts. And the consciousness that is to serve as this common plain.

\section*{2. Act Modification in the Course of its Interpretation as an Object}

> “Apperception is our surplus, which is found in experience itself, in its descriptive

\(^{5}\) A. Półtawski, Świat, postrzeganie, świadomość” (The World, Perception, Consciousness), Wraszawa 1973, p. 172

\(^{6}\) E. Husserl, “Kryzys nauk europejskich i fenomenologia transcendentalna” (Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology), transl. by S. Walczewska, Kraków 1987.


\(^{8}\) F. Brentano, Psychologie, I, p.115 in E. Husserl, op. cit, p. 554
content as opposed to the raw existence of sense: it is the act-character which as it were ensouls sense, and is in essence such as to make us perceive this or that object (...) Sensations, and the acts “interpreting them” or “apperceiving” them, are alike experienced, but they do not appear as objects: they are not seen, heard, perceived by any sense. Objects, on the other hand, appear and are perceived, but they are not experienced.”

It follows from the above that neither sensations (raw data) nor acts are perceived. We assume their existence as a result of an analytical process - this result strikes with its self-evident nature, but it is not directly accessible. In order for this surplus, which Husserl labelled as apperception, to be grasped by us, it needs to be described. The fact that sensations “are experienced” clearly does not suffice for them to become objects of consciousness. Therefore, experience is something which is located outside what is conscious, because consciousness is always the consciousness of a certain object.

This inseparable closeness that is so peculiar for the act and its object makes Husserl’s assertion that it is enough to “reverse the direction of perceiving” and instead of phenomena to interpret acts of which they are constituted, is extremely impressive. But since we come to deal here with this realisation, becoming aware, which is a certain process, then some of the terminological distinctions that Husserl proposes must be labelling what has not been realised yet. And what cannot, at least in the sense of being certain phenomenon, be realised. We become aware of intentions by creating a notion of intentions. But the intention itself is not conscious.

So as Merleau-Ponty referred to a positivist assumption that sensitive data are primarily intuitive as “a myth of scientific consciousness”\textsuperscript{10}, so Husserl’s assumption about the intuitive nature of intentional acts may be labelled as “a myth of phenomenological consciousness.”

In order for an intention or act to become a phenomenon, an object of consciousness, it needs to change its manner of existence completely. Husserl was aware of that. When analysing the difficulties that arise in connection with the phenomenological investigation, he wrote:

“…When we pass over from naively performed acts to an attitude of reflection, or when we perform acts proper to such reflection, our former acts necessarily undergo change. How can we rightly assess the nature and extent of such change? How indeed can we know anything whatever about it, whether as a fact or a necessity of essence.”\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{9} E. Husserl, \textit{Logical Investigations}, vol. II, p.567
\textsuperscript{10} M. Merleau-Ponty, \textit{Phenomenology de la perception}, Paris 1945, p.12
In “Investigation IV” Husserl discusses the so-called *suppositio materialis* which may be viewed as a model of change.

“Every expression (…) can also function as its own name, i.e., it will name itself as a grammatical phenomenon. If we say ‘‘The earth is round’’ is a statement’, our subject-presentation is not the meaning of the statement, but a presentation of the statement as such. We do not judge about the fact that the earth is round, but about the indicative sentence (…) We have an exact analogue of suppositio materialis when an expression has, instead of its normal meaning, a presentation of this meaning (i.e., a meaning directed to this meaning as object).”\(^\text{12}\)

It seems that similar change, though more profound, must affect what we call an act, an intention, in order for it to become an object of study, of objective knowledge. We do not so much examine acts as their representations, petrified, frozen notions of what in its very essence is a motion, creation, realisation. If we were to follow the language of phenomenology we would say that we mistake intention with its fulfilment and its is the fulfilment that we examine, making ourselves believe that we are focused on the act by which this fulfilment was constituted. As if someone were claiming that a piece of basalt rock may be identified with a stream of cooling down lava. We try to examine as an object something which in its essence is a directed activity.

However, Husserl was clearly reluctant to espouse a vision of intentional act as a kind of activity, most probably for the sole reason that he would immediately need to ask a question about the carrier of such activity, about energy that turns into meaning. To Husserl activity was inseparably linked with the subject examined by positive sciences, with empiricism, whereas he wanted to remain in the sphere of ideal senses. That is why he wrote:

“\textquote{In talking of ‘acts,’ on the other hand, we must steer clear of the word’s original meaning: all thought of activity must be rigidly excluded.}’’ And in the footnote: \textquote{‘‘…we define ‘acts’ as intentional experiences, not as mental activities.’’}\(^\text{13}\)

It is possible, however, to root the understanding of an act outside contemporary science, outside empiricism. To this end one needs to pursue ontological argumentation which would focus on the difference between the order of cognition and the order of existence. This kind of construct may be found in scholastic thinking.

\(^{13}\) Op. cit. p.563
3. ESSENCE AND EXISTENCE

When Etienne Gilson discusses the meaning of a break-through that St. Thomas of Aquinas made in our understanding of existence, he focuses on a difference between the order of perception (and cognition) of beings and the order of their existence.

“First we perceive certain beings, then we define them as to their essence and then we affirm their existence by means of judgement. However, from a metaphysical point of view the order of reality is the reverse of the order of human perception. As the first component of this reality is a certain act of existence, which by being the very act of existence immediately defines an essence (…)”

St. Thomas said: *dictur esse ipse actus essentiae*. “Being is an act by which an essence exists.

We are of the opinion that this sentence may be referred without any modifications to Husserl’s “act” and “essence”. Strongly imbedded in the word “act” is an image of something happening which in Husserl’s analysis is recurrent and - what is more - fulfils important functions. As, for example, in a fragment of his elucidations on the phenomenological relation between the word and meaning in Par. 19 of Volume II.

“Generally the greatest energy will be displayed by the act-character which comprehends and subsumes all partial acts in its unity.” And further on: “..we attend, when not distracted, to the signified rather than the signs. Dominant energy resides in the sense-giving acts.”

Which clearly demonstrates that Husserl, too, could not stop thinking about a dynamic, sense-giving moment of greatest energy which is inherent in the notion of act. On the one hand, this moment imposed itself in a compelling way, while on the other hand, it posed a threat to the
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14 E. Gilson, “Bóg i filozofia” (God and Philosophy), Warszawa 1982, p.56
15 St. Thomas Aquinas in I Sent. 33,1,1 ad.1, from E. Gilson, op. cit.
16 E. Husserl, op.cit. p. 582
entire structure of reasoning followed in the “Investigations…” And not only because, on the surface, it could be associated with empiricism.

A difficulty that arises when we want to demonstrate a dynamic aspect of an intentional act - the one which stands for motion, energy, flux - is of much profounder nature. In order to grasp this difficulty best, it is necessary to go back the critique of motion formulated in a paradox by Zeno of Elea. Let us then reiterate after the sceptics: in order to conceptually grasp a flying arrow in compliance with intuition, with imaginative intuition, it is necessary to halt it in a point of time of zero duration. But when the arrow is no longer in motion, then mere summation of such points cannot reproduce motion. Mathematicians usually argue that underlying this reasoning is a mistake - the location of the arrow at a certain point is described with the help of three spatial variables instead of introducing a fourth variable, that of momentum, that would stand for motion. But this mistake is by no means accidental. Human intuition, especially when it avails of sight - which lies at the root of the European philosophical thinking - interprets an object mainly as spatial and as located in space. Hannah Arendt noted that this kind of, makes it possible to introduce

“an observer, who (...) does not treat the present as merely a passing moment of experience, but transforms it into ‘a dimension where things may be perceived as lasting’. Only the sight provides us with sensual foundations owing to which the mind may comprehend the idea of eternity, the idea of what never changes and what is always present.”17

This is how an immobile arrow is perceived in the paradox of Zeno of Elea. In thus perceived an arrow there is no momentum, the momentum is not apprehended, what is apprehended is the arrow’s position in space. But, as a matter of fact, there is no such a thing as a present moment extending in eternity. This kind of “moment” is a product of consciousness which grasps an object in its permanence, because what is unchangeable guarantees the truth, and to a human being - it is a guarantee that the world can be interpreted and grasped. As H. Arendt puts it, it is a guarantee of theoretical truth.

It is not unfounded that Husserl is regarded as one of the last “philosophers of sight”. Many analyses included in “Logical Investigations” support this observation. The very notion of ideal senses - unchangeable and transcending time - is a clear reference to this particular tradition. The problem, however, is not as simple as that. It is owing to his insight and honesty that Husserl had to admit that any phenomenon and any event appears as temporal. The analysis
of signified intentions and their fulfilment resulted in the posing of the problem of “dynamism” and how such relations “unfold themselves in a temporal pattern”\textsuperscript{18}. The same problem was examined by Husserl in his “Lectures on the Phenomenology of Internal Consciousness of Time.”

Nevertheless, predominant in his “Logical Investigations” is the motif of permanence. It was what the identified goal required - a quest for the phenomenological foundations of unchangeable and absolute logical truths. Husserl was seeking those foundations in the permanence of ideal senses and categorial moments which shape real phenomena. A conceptual grasping of an intentional act facilitated that quest. This conceptual grasping was tantamount to the replacement of the act itself when understood as “happening”, as a process of realisation of what is not conscious, by the notion of act, representation, something that belongs to a different ontological order, to the sphere of phenomena. By assuming, however, that the phenomena that really appear are always sensible and temporal, and at the same time that the act of constituting them belongs to an ideal order, to the order of what is unchangeable and not temporal, Husserl came to face a magnitude of difficulties.\textsuperscript{19} For the constituting act is change and that is why it is not intuitive. In order to move the borders of what is intuitive so that it encompasses the constitution of an act it was necessary to make it immobile and static. This in turn resulted in the elimination of motion and change from the sphere of consciousness. However, in the world of immobile, ideal meanings the flux of phenomena was hard to explain - that the melody keeps flowing, that it unfolds, that one sound is followed by another. And it is the above mentioned “Lectures” that are a profound - and successful as it seems - attempt to escape the Parmenidean trap, an attempt to grasp the consciousness of one moment as a fusing of change and permanence. In his “Investigations” Husserl does, however, focus on the examination of permanence, constancy of meanings which he incorporates in the signified intention. How the latter notion is to be interpreted, will the topic of our further deliberations.

4. HUSSERL’S METAPHORS

“All philosophical notions are metaphors, petrified analogies, and their real sense becomes evident when we reach back to their original context which inspired the mind of a philosopher who was the first to use them.”\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} H. Arendt, Myslenie (Thinking), Warszawa 1991, p.165
\textsuperscript{18} E. Husserl, op. cit. p. 695
\textsuperscript{19} cf. A. Półtawski, op. cit. pp. 123-125
It clearly follows from the foregoing that such notions fundamental to Husserl’s phenomenology as acts and intentions are discursive expressions of unrealised preconditions which are indispensable for such phenomena to appear the way they appear. Those “preconditions” exist in a different way than the very objects of consciousness. We obtain our knowledge of them indirectly, from the phenomena, their motion, from their on-going flux which fuses permanence, owing to which we are able to grasp any thing, and change, which accounts for the entire richness of consciousness. However, this kind of reasoning brings into mind a situation when we speak about a volcano eruption based on the examination of the basalt rock that has already cooled down. We have the right to do that, as long as we do not mistake an object with the process by which it was shaped, as well as conditions of that process. The notions merely represent this process - not conscious out of necessity - and the essence of this representation cannot be mistaken for the essence of what it represents. It seems that Husserl, although to him we attribute the elucidation of a difference between an act and a phenomenon, did not take it consistently into consideration when he delimited the borders of what he labelled as consciousness. In this sphere, being ontologically homogenous and closed, he placed both the phenomena and the formal prerequisites of their existence. Whereas it seems that the phenomena and intentional acts, which precondition the former, belong to two different orders from the ontological point of view.

The constituting of phenomena, their emergence in the field of consciousness is a process which certainly does reach towards what is not conscious. Acts may be understood as a new metaphor for Leibnitz’s *vis activa*, of this force that pushes consciousness to create *cognitiones*. Or they may be viewed as a supplement to the drive, in the Freudean sense of the term, which manifests itself on the verge of the conscious. It needs, however, to be remembered that all those notions merely stand for an attempt to grasp in discourse the indispensable preconditions of the process in which phenomena of the subjective-objective consciousness become constituted. And that they share the weaknesses with the notions that belong to certain kinds of discourse.

An intention, like a ray, is directed at something, which is an ideal object of the act. The metaphor of the ray is a follow up of Husserl’s myth of the self-conscious nature of the act, it takes it into the sphere of visual and radiating truth. The ray illuminates the ideal sense. This construct is strongly rooted in the picture of the consciousness that goes back to Descartes. Consciousness as a sphere transparent and completely bright, self-cognizant. Except that this
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28 H. Arendt, Myslenie (Thinking), Warszawa 1991, p. 155
picture, as we have demonstrated above, is highly mythologized. If the act of constituting, an intention, a web of intentions are situated outside the borders of what is conscious, then this metaphor is misleading in that it leads us in the direction of false intuitions. Because when referring to a “ray” we need to ask about its source, about the space in which the ray turns in a specific direction\textsuperscript{21}, about its character as well as about the character of what it is aimed at.

Our mental world falls into an “I that is aiming”, a ray and an ideal goal. What is more, we need to come to terms with the ontological status of individual components of that metaphor - what is ego, what is a ray, what is a phenomenon and what is an ideal object? We come to face an awesome vision of a box filled with “ideal senses” as something shaped by experience, at which individual acts are aimed, because “the ray” must “illuminate” something. But Husserl himself discards this vision:

“… one forgets that the objects of which we are ‘conscious,’ are not simply in consciousness as in a box, so that they can merely be found in it and snatched at in it…”\textsuperscript{22}

As a matter of fact Husserl’s metaphor of the ray is highly misleading. Because it does not correspond with the apprehension of “hitting” or “illuminating”, but rather with an image of aiming. But a ray of light cannot be aiming at something. It either illuminates it or not. In fact the metaphor of the ray- which happens to be coherent\textsuperscript{23} with the assumptions that Husserl made along Descartes’ line and which is so frequently used by him - has as its contents the act of aiming which cannot by itself belong to the ray! Quite different images correspond with this act than with illuminating or hitting.

“The term intention hits off the peculiarity of acts by imagining them to aim at something, (…) In our metaphor an act of hitting the mark corresponds to that of aiming and just so certain acts correspond as achievements or fulfilments.”\textsuperscript{24}

In the very first sentence Husserl clearly identifies the intention with aiming at something. Hitting the aim is a correlate, so the way we understand, it is a constituted object of

\textsuperscript{21} cf. A. Półtawski, op. cit. p.152
\textsuperscript{22} E. Husserl, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 385
\textsuperscript{23} in the sense proposed in the works by Lakoff and Johnson, “Metafory w naszym życiu” (Metaphors in Our Life), Warszawa 1988.
consciousness. Whereas aiming is a moment that precedes hitting - so it is an “empty” moment. The metaphor of aiming brings about the intuition of a moment of suspension, the moment of the highest tension, when, however, nothing has happened yet. This moment seems to be in need of being supplemented by the “hitting”, but since it precedes the latter by a wink, it is pure potentiality. In our view this is what best explains Husserl’s apprehension of the intention.

The more so that this particular image is so close to the third metaphor that Husserl has used. An intention, particularly the signitive intention, may be an empty space which is in need of being filled with intuition. This picture is brought to one’s mind when one follows the analysis included in the Investigation VI. An unfinished tune which “is in need” of being finished, a hidden part of a carpet which “attracts” our thinking - these are the manifestations of webs of intentions which are not yet conscious, but which are only a “step” away from becoming conscious.

“… signitive intentions are in themselves ‘empty’ and they ‘are in need of fullness’”\textsuperscript{25}. Or “Purely signitive acts are, however, ‘empty’…”\textsuperscript{26}

Such formulations by Husserl brings into mind an image of an empty space, of certain a b s e n c e, the negation of a specific phenomenal fulfilment. What marks this fulfilment, what accounts for its individual “peculiarity” stems from the fact that:

“All perceiving and imagining is a web of partial intentions, fused together in the unity of a single total intention. The correlate of this last intention is the thing, while the correlate of its partial intention are the thing’s parts and aspects”\textsuperscript{27}

Since intentions themselves are empty “waiting” for the phenomena, their web brings about an image of certain empty intentional space, which, however, cannot be anything specific, because only the phenomenon, what appears, may be the t h i n g. An intentional space becomes manifest in this thing, it is a metaphor of a necessary precondition in order for a t h i n g to appear, so it exists in a manner different that that “thing”.

A intentional space may be best pictured by drawing an analogy with a bent, non-isometric physical space which is filled with a field. According to some models of mathematical

\textsuperscript{24} E. Husserl, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 563  
\textsuperscript{25} E. Husserl, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 728  
\textsuperscript{26} OP. cit. Vol. II, p. 744  
physics the appearance of what we call objects in space is an outcome of an appropriate field configuration which fills that space. As if the “bending” or “caving in” of space in a specific dimension would tip the equilibrium to such an extent that in this particular spot an object in a form of a corpuscle would appear. One may similarly understand the emergence of a phenomenon in the intentional space. A field which fills the intentional space is a need to be filled, a need of “fulfilment”, an essential aspiration towards an open being, to put it in Heideggers’ terms. This drift towards the object which was labelled by Freud as the “drive” accounts for the dynamic nature of consciousness. A self-fulfilling intention is an aspiration which at a specific moment in time is, in Husserl’s own words, “most active”. The fact that one phenomenon appears while another does not depends on the present status of intentional space.

5. INTENTIONAL SPACE AND UNCONSCIOUSNESS

“In the texture of conscious, intentional experience, there are many possibilities of pointing selection of acts and act-complexes, which remain for the most part unrealised.”

What Husserl actually refers to in the above sentence is the unconscious. What is unrealised never becomes the object of consciousness, so it is not conscious. In fact, Husserl made his notion of consciousness to include the Freudian unconscious. Because a trauma, which is pushed out of our consciousness, may be understood as one of potential act-complexes that remain unrealised, because other acts (related to what Freud labels as “resistance”) prevent them on account of their activity.

The metaphor in which an intention stands for an “empty space,” pure potentiality which is in need of being filled and which is filled by the object of consciousness, the related concept of intentional space which is a void in which present are various webs of intentions, may serve to reconstruct the notion of unconsciousness. For it enables to resolve fundamental aporia stemming from Freud’s theory and the ensuing concepts put forward by Jung and Lacan. We are short of space to develop a comprehensive discussion of that problem, but we may only highlight the most important issues.

Does the phenomenon of a trauma exist in the unconscious in a similar manner as its image of which we become aware of at the time of analysis? If so, then does it mean that we have two “fields of consciousness,” except that one of them is inaccessible? By espousing the
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concept by which all the is not conscious is rather a certain intentional space which owing to its properties determines the manner in which the phenomena of the consciousness are constituted, we may solve that problem in an obvious way.

Now the second question. How are we to interpret the transformation of driving energy into meaning? How can we cross the ontological border between the order of beings and the order of meanings? As we have earlier written, if signitive intention is understood as an act by which the existence of an essence is identified we may depart from the empirical and biological contents of the notion of act. But what would this mean in the context of the constitution of meaning?

It was Husserl who emphasised that only this meaning is fulfilled which is marked by which is “most active”. In the “Investigation VI” he describes an illusion which we may experience in the museum of wax figures. If I see an accurately sculpted figure of a woman, then I may conclude for a moment that it is an object of desire and perceive it as a work of a skilful artisan. Which of the meanings would surface would solely depend on the condition of our intentional space, on which webs of intentions would become dominant. The very same sign, object - the figure - may direct us to different meanings, to various intentional objects. Then what is meaning?

“The notion of a dog means as much as a rule/law according to which my imagination may in general terms sketch a figure of a certain quadruped creature…”  

wrote I. Kant. What is essential to us is the fact that the notion which we identify with its meaning is here a rule which governs our imagination. In our view, however, it is not that it makes it possible to sketch a “figure of a quadruped creature”, but creates a place for a stream of subsequent images and notions, which means that it affects the contents of subsequent intentions that “are in need” of being fulfilled. If an intention is an empty place in a space of an intentional web, then the self-fulfilling meaning is the modification of that space, the modification which makes each subsequent intention necessary to appear, another empty place to be filled. It is exactly the same in the case of a tune that we hear. At each moment it modifies intentional space, creating new webs of intentions which become manifest in our readiness to “sing” the rest of the tune. Inherent in “meaning” is the direction of motion in intentional space.

Such an understanding of meaning makes it possible to address the problem posed by Ricoeur, the problem of the energy aspect being converted into the phenomenal aspect, the problem which always emerges when the relation between not conscious and conscious is discussed, between the unconsciousness and consciousness. This emptiness, “absence” which is in need to be filled - with this particular, specific object - may explain why some webs of intentions are more active than others, why sometimes a wax figure presents itself as a woman, and sometimes as an artisan’s work. It may also explain why we can dream about what we have not yet experienced.