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<Discordancy and abnormality. Constitution of a subjectively and intersubjectively univocal nature possible only through normal experiencing of the abnormal>[[1]](#footnote-1)

*<Content:> The perception of intuitional nature. The possibility to grasp intersubjectively the empirical truth in descriptions. This truth is the [truth] of the experience in normal sensuality. But the abnormal is not a stimulus for the possibility of objective description and descriptive sciences. Concerning the constitution of empirical nature.*

Descriptive sciences as sciences are of course directed towards the objective acceptance of their statements; and the aiming at cognizance is brought about in purely theoretical interest under suspension of all judgment-motives of the mind being more interested in the being thus than in the being other. Suspension of all desires, of all habitual passions, etc. This is about the bringing out of the true itself, and of its true determinations in the purely “verifying” grounding. The description of the **descriptive natural science** indeed moves within the frame of the intersubjectively univocal, concretely intuitional experience, i.e., thus, like for every experiencing [subject] a nature is there intuitionally prior to the description and to the scientifically descriptive method, univocally persisting in continuously synthetic experiences, showing itself in a concretely intuitional way (overcoming all discordancies) through higher harmony as being the same. And thus, like one and the same nature shows itself as the same being experienced by me and everyone else, overcoming the intersubjective discordancies, within the intersubjective connection of experiential subjects communicating mutually, - thus I also shape and have shaped manifold experiential concepts as being intuitional, through comparison, universalities accruing through overlapping coincidence of the intuitionally common. And these common concepts **[646]** are also intersubjectively common; concrete terms like “tree”, “house”, “stone”, etc. and abstract terms of single intuitional predicates, commonly universal properties. If nature is a univocal unity of experience (as a concrete idea of an intersubjective identity as pervasive harmony of synthetically unified experiences), then –spoken ideally – it must be possible to bring out concrete intuitional terms, which describe the experienced nature and [which] describe in an intersubjectively identical way.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Nature is a constant presumption for the experiencing [subject] (and for the communicative community, if it does not already presuppose the present of nature); and if it constantly leaves open the possibility of discordancies then the idea of an experience implies, in spite of occurring possible discordancy, that each discordancy dissolves in a higher harmony.

What is the relation between **discordancy and abnormality**?

Each kind of abnormality at first designates a type of disturbance of the experiential harmony, a disappointment of the anticipation lying within it and initially justifying in an evident way (expectation). If this discordancy shall dissolve in a “higher harmony”, - what is generally required, and initially for every kind of discordancy as such?

We indeed do have to distinguish **two kinds of discordancies**: 1) A thing (a “supposed” one in the experience, experienced as being thus), shows itself within synthetic experience as being “different” (not as having changed), than it had been supposed to be. Or an event of the experience **develops in a different way than expected**; an anticipated course of causality does not eventuate but another one. (Likewise recollection). But all this while the perceiving proceeds “normally”. 2) The **discordancies through abnormal perceiving**, through change of the normal perceptual conditions, through abnormality of the perceptual organism.

It still needs to be considered whether these are all cases. In the one case we correct and supplement our judgments while remaining purely within the **[647]** direction of the supposed experiential objectivities; we measure something experienced with the help of something experienced. In the other case we go back from the experienced to the “experiential circumstances”. Within experience itself, according to its own sense-giving, in the way that experience wants to be an experience of an object (so to say), lies the relation of the experienced objectivities to systems of “circumstances”, that is a) to a **normal system** of motivating circumstances (in the case of the unbroken experiential believe); but this further implies b) a constitutive systematic relatedness to this system of “normal”, first and foremost constituting circumstances to changed systems of circumstances, to **systems of abnormal circumstances** to which the abnormal changes of the experiencing unity belong as unity of appearance. But going back to these changed appearances the unbroken unity of the belief persists, the unbroken harmony of the object as being the same, if the changed appearances as those belonging to the abnormal circumstances are clearly conscious. The object is the same (in its own unchange and change, in its own being thus); it just looks differently from normal circumstances, but [it looks] like it has to look under these [circumstances]. But what the object is like in truth is only seen within the circle of normal givenness; **only the normal look shows the intuitional truth**, one just has to approach the object itself within the normal experiential circle, and to ever more perfect the experience. How is this to be understood?

It needs to be heeded here that, as soon as the experiencing subject has a reason to, instead of judging the object straightforwardly, rather deviating [and] **judging perceptual conditions**, he then judges his organism, the corresponding **organs of sensation**, and the normal or abnormal functioning. **If he does so then he judges his organism** (eye, and hand, and ear, etc.) himself within the frame of normal experience, that is, in such a way that he perceives, sees, touches, etc. his organism with “suchlike senses”. He experiences in normal seeing that his burnt finger is swollen, and otherwise is abnormal, and likewise in normal touching with the other fingers of the normal other hand, etc. he states exactly the same abnormal change: The burnt finger has changed according to its type, furthermore it is **[648]** equipped with unusual tactile sensations at touching, aching, etc.

It can be discerned that **only due to the abnormal being experienceable by normal experiencing**, as something normal of a changed form, and **only due to the fact that [subjects] experiencing in a normal way experience a foreign, abnormally changed organism as normal object at the alter ego, that he can constitute a subjectively and intersubjectively univocal nature**.

Thus: The constitution of a being nature for experiencing subjects presupposes a certain structure of the perceptual organization, namely in such a way, that abnormally changed appearances of physical things must be related to a **normally** experienceable organism, but as having changed in the normal type of being. The swollen finger is a normally experienceable and experienced thing, a [thing] which in truth has changed; but a change of the ways of perception of things being experienced by this finger in its function as organ of perception is connected to this typical change. And these ways of appearance are not the “true” ones, they only point back to true ways of appearance for normal organs, and on the other hand to an abnormally changed organism.

Each abnormal appearance has its **relative right**; but it does not show that which is true in that which is experienced by it. Its experiential belief is suspended as soon as the normal experience shows the corresponding organ of perception which had been changed in its normal shape, to which it is related: The **true nature** as being experienced in truth is the idea of a pervasively univocal, that is, in unbroken belief experienced nature ever verifying itself; and as soon as the nature is constituted through our proceeding experience, it continuously carries along the rightful anticipation of pervasive harmony and of the pervasive possibility to exhibit its truth as intuitional truth, and this constitutes itself within the **normality** of the organism’s experiencing.

**[649]**

Appendix LI

<Solitary and intersubjective normality>[[3]](#footnote-3)

**At the very first I have normality within my solitary Ego**. Normal organism, which persists as being normal, and even when single abnormalities stand out with it, which still need to be ranged among normalities. Conditions of the becoming abnormal are experienced through a normally functioning organism within the bodiliness of the organism, the truth of which is that of the normal experience.

Empathy supposes “foreign organism”, and thereby [it supposes] a second normal one, and an also possibly in detail abnormal organism; and within the verification of the empathy the foreign normality has to coincide with the proper one – sufficiently in order to enable the identification. But it is not excluded that only in creating a conversation differences between one’s own and the foreign “normality” (that which everyone has constituted for himself initially under that title) emerge due to a community. But which normality is right now? There the difficulties lie. Within common life we have constituted an **intersubjective normality**, and a corresponding intersubjective normal experiential world as the true one, and abnormalities of single subjects. All the abnormalities of single ones, transcending the de facto optima belong to the intersubjective normality, which lie in the course of the optimal rise, which everyone knows as horizons of rise (that is, an especially good eye, etc.). The intersubjective normality thus implies a multiform ideal of rise (an eye being as good as possible, sense of hearing being as fine as possible, etc.). In contrast to this the proper abnormal is that which breaks the experiential harmony (like already with the Ego) to certain sides. But this break is constitutively related to the system of normal experience, and fits itself again into it under the title “man with an abnormal organism”.

1. Around 1921. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Concerning the following Husserl notes on the margin of the manuscript’s first page „On the next pages an excellent explication of univocally experienced nature with relation to normality and abnormality.” – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Around 1921. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)