

Heidegger, Husserl and the “feeling of evidence”

Introduction: Phenomenology’s Project of Grounding Knowledge in Evidence

Affective phenomena occupy a central position in Heidegger’s philosophy, both in his early phenomenological work and in his later work.¹ In *Being and Time* (BT), affective phenomena are manifested in the notions of disposition (*Befindlichkeit*) and mood (*Stimmung*). Moods constitute a distinct faculty of existence; they are *necessary conditions* for the constitution of understanding and the capacity to judge. It is via moods that the world is meaningful for us. Hence, moods are essential to any normative notion of “authenticity.”

In BT, “authenticity” (*Eigentlichkeit*) is the achievement of resolute self-transparency, a comportment that embraces existential anxiety (*Angst*) and reveals the deep temporal essence of Dasein. But anxiety also serves a crucial methodological function: in revealing the deeper structures of Dasein, anxiety is *evidence* for ontological understanding, understanding of the meaning of Being. Ascribing to moods such an evidentiary function means that Heidegger’s phenomenology is opposed to Husserl’s when it comes to the problem of evidence. For Husserl, phenomenology cannot be grounded in any sort of feeling, because feeling cannot count as evidence for knowledge or understanding; in fact, when Husserl elaborates on his conception of “evidence” he explicitly develops his own definition in opposition to the notion of the “feeling of evidence” (*Evidenzgefühl*).

The way Heidegger and Husserl differ on the concept of “evidence” is crucial for phenomenology, because it concerns the very heart of phenomenology, namely the way *knowledge is grounded in phenomenological evidence*. The divergence bears on the epistemological question of what counts as evidence. In taking moods to be “evidence,” Heidegger tries to relocate the foundation of truth and ontology on a pre-reflective level of understanding. Heidegger’s turn to affectivity is an attempt to ground transcendental philosophy in facticity.

Husserl aims to establish a firm footing for the scientific method of phenomenology by setting firm normative standards according to which all findings of phenomenology must be grounded in evidence. His aim is to ensure that the findings of phenomenology amount to justified knowledge; in this context, he puts the epoché in place and devises the Principle of All Principles, which determines the golden epistemological standard of apodictic certainty. In effect, the Principle of All Principles purifies consciousness and guarantees that phenomenological reflection, i.e. originary intuition, provides *evidence* for transcendental knowledge.

Heideggerian authenticity, on the other hand, is the achievement of “resoluteness” (*Entschlossenheit*). Resoluteness is a comportment that is as much about a way of existence as it is about a way of relating to the being of the world and its ontological structures, i.e. a way of understanding the way the meaning of Being is constituted. It is, in other words, a primordial understanding of the grounding (transcendental) structures of the meaning of Being. Resoluteness, therefore, has a methodological function: it is a normative criterion that, once brought into view, enables the *reinterpretation* of Dasein and the meaning of Being, much like the epoché in Husserl enables the reinterpretation of phenomena. We ought to think of Heidegger’s notion of resoluteness in BT as analogous to Husserl’s Principle of Evidence and the Apodictic Reduction inasmuch as they all ground transcendental knowledge in evidence. The difference between them lies in their definitions of evidence: one’s definition of evidence looks at affects; the other’s looks away.

¹ For helpful comments on different versions of this paper, I am indebted to Dan Dahlstrom, Maeve Cook and Anna Bortolan.

In this context, the work of the neo-Kantian philosopher Heinrich Rickert becomes relevant for two reasons: (a) because Husserl's own notion of "evidence" is developed in contrast to Rickert's notion of the "feeling of evidence" (*Evidenzgefühl*);² (b) because even though Heidegger himself also explicitly criticizes Rickert's notion of "evidence," his own position on "evidence" is closer to Rickert than he admits. I will not explicate here exactly how Heidegger's position on "evidence" is closer to Rickert's, as it is beyond the scope of this essay, but I do wish to use this essay as an opportunity to set the stage for a future, detailed analysis of this relationship. I am not arguing that Heidegger and Rickert share the same position on evidence—far from it. Their philosophies are radically different. I am only arguing for a shared interest in feelings and the role they can play in grounding knowledge, which becomes relevant for this essay by implication, since Husserl develops his own position *contra* Rickert's while Heidegger tries to rehabilitate the evidentiary role of feelings *contra* Husserl's position.

For Rickert, knowledge is to be identified with valid judgment. Validity is determined by the feeling that accompanies judgment, the certainty (*Gewißheit*) of evidence (*Evidenz*), which constitutes the bindingness of judgment, giving to the judgment the character of necessity (*Notwendigkeit*).³ The evidential certainty that constitutes the bindingness of judgment is ascribed to feeling and appetite. Rickert's theory of judgment remains Brentanian in that "judgment is the simple affirmation or negation of some presented content."⁴ When we judge, we concur with the representations or we reject them. Invested in the judgment as its essential element is a "practical comportment." The key question is: How is the *bindingness* of a true judgment achieved? Rickert solves this problem by referring to a peculiar feeling of certainty that accompanies true judgment, which he calls the "feeling of evidence" (*Evidenzgefühl*). This "feeling of evidence" is further identified with a feeling of pleasure: a judgment made with certainty is necessarily accompanied by "a feeling of pleasure" (*ein Lustgefühl*), which *indicates the truth*, the necessary outcome of judgment (*die Urteilsnotwendigkeit*).⁵

A caveat is needed before we proceed. Heidegger had followed Husserl in rejecting Rickert's notion of the "feeling of evidence." Heidegger dismisses the "feeling of evidence" not because he disagrees that evidence has anything to do with affect, but rather because he regards *feelings* as subjective, whereas "mood" designates, for him, a phenomenon beyond the subject-object dichotomy. One could object that Heidegger's notion of "mood" (and "disposition") should be strictly distinguished from the notion of "feeling." Heidegger repeatedly insists that we should not confuse moods with ontic feelings or emotions⁶ since the former are ontological whereas the latter are ontic. However, I think this is a sheer matter of semantics. The objection can be overcome once one sees mood, following Matthew Ratcliffe, as a sort of "existential feeling."⁷

Before we turn to the next section, let me reiterate this essay's overarching arguments and set out its structure. The essay tries to show that Heidegger's rehabilitation of affect involves a radicalization of the very notion of "evidence," of what counts as "evidence" for Dasein's understanding of the ground structures of the meaning of Being. Heidegger's ontology involves a methodological radicalization of phenomenology itself, *contra* Husserl. In this context, I show how

² The "feeling of evidence" is an ambiguous phrase in that it may be taken as a subjective genitive or an objective genitive. Does it refer to the evidence that belongs to feeling, or to feeling that belongs to evidence? In other words, does it refer to feeling as evidence, or to evidence as feeling? I will not try to resolve this dilemma here, as this is beyond the scope of this essay.

³ "Dieses Gefühl ist 'Gewißheit' (Evidenz) [...] 'Zugleich erlebe ich Mich als durch das Gefühl der Evidenz *gebunden*' [...] 'Das eine oder andere Urteil ist immer notwendig'. Die Evidenz, 'das Gefühl', gibt einem Urteil den Charakter der *Notwendigkeit* (eine Notwendigkeit des Sollens)" Martin Heidegger, *Zur Bestimmung der Philosophie* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klosterman, 1999), 188.

⁴ See Andrea Staiti, "Husserl and Rickert on the Nature of Judgment," *Philosophy Compass* 10, no. 12 (2015): 816.

⁵ See George Heffernan, "A Study in the Sedimented Origins of Evidence: Husserl and His Contemporaries Engaged in a Collective Essay in the Phenomenology and Psychology of Epistemic Justification," *Husserl Studies* 16 (1999): 83–181.

⁶ See *Being and Time* (GA 2), trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 177–8.

⁷ See Matthew Ratcliffe, *Feelings of Being: Phenomenology, Psychiatry, and the Sense of Reality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

and why Heidegger holds that Husserl's phenomenology, just like Descartes' philosophy, is "guided by the predominance of an empty and thereby fantastic idea of certainty and evidence."⁸

In section 1, I analyze Husserl's notion of "evidence." In the first part, I explicate the sense in which Husserl's entire phenomenological project is about grounding knowledge in evidence. I show how knowledge is guaranteed by the methodological "Principle of All Principles" and explain Husserl's (later) positive definition of "evidence" in terms of apodictic certainty. I dedicate the second part to showing how Husserl's definition of "evidence" is developed in opposition to the notion of the "feeling of evidence" (*Evidenzgefühl*).

In section 2, I give an account of Heidegger's critique of Husserl's conceptualization of "evidence." In part 1, I demonstrate how, for Heidegger, the Husserlian notion of "evidence" develops out of Husserl's care for achieving certainty, which determines his conceptions of science and knowledge, and leads him to believe that knowledge can be gained only after a process of purification undergone by consciousness. In part 2, I explain how Husserl inherits from Descartes clarity and distinctness as the criteria for truth. In part 3, I analyze how Husserl's transcendental turn, associated with his turn to Cartesian epistemology, mangles his earlier conception of intentionality, as well as his conception of emotional life and the notion of "evidence."

In section 3, I offer an account of the relation between feeling (disposition) and evidence in Heidegger's BT. In part 1, I offer a general overview of the way disposition relates to understanding Being-in-the-world in BT. In part 2, I demonstrate how Heidegger's rehabilitation of affect radicalizes the notion of "evidence," as Husserl conceives it. Finally, in part 3, I focus on Angst and resoluteness and show how Angst serves as the evidence that grounds the knowledge of resoluteness.

1. Husserl on Evidence and His Critique of *Evidenzgefühl*

The notion of "evidence" (*Evidenz*) is a key notion in Husserl's phenomenology. This section comprises two parts. In part one, I argue that "evidence" relates to the project of *grounding knowledge* and so in this regard constitutes perhaps the most crucial epistemological notion. In this context, I focus on his later definition of "evidence" qua apodicticity. In part two, I focus on Husserl's unvarying *negative* definition of evidence, i.e. its definition as the opposite of *feeling*, and the concomitant critique of *Evidenzgefühl* and Rickert.

1.1. Grounding Knowledge in Apodictic Evidence

Some commentators have convincingly argued that Husserl's phenomenology is a project of grounding knowledge in *evidence*. In a sense, the Husserlian project is a modern philosophical one whose aim is to offer a foundation for cognitive knowledge, in line with the general idea of science. As such, it is a continuation of the Cartesian project of discovering a safe starting point that can serve as the foundation upon which to build the philosophical edifice. This grounding character permeates the entire Husserlian corpus, from the early work to the later work. For the purposes of this essay, it is safe to say that Husserlian phenomenology is a type of foundationalist exercise with the overarching aim of achieving a version of epistemological foundationalism.⁹ If phenomenology claims to be a presuppositionless science, then it must offer the evidence upon which the epistemic edifice rests. "Evidence" is therefore the rationale for the development of his transcendental phenomenology; it is "the hidden spring of phenomenology."¹⁰

The very "discovery" of the notion of "evidence" is associated with the process of "genuine grounding," as Husserl himself says in *Cartesian Meditations* (CM), in which he argues that in

⁸ Heidegger, *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, 33.

⁹ For a critical discussion of Husserl's (non)foundationalism, see: Walter Hopp, "Husserl, Phenomenology, and Foundationalism," *Inquiry* 51, no. 2 (2008): 194–216 and Dagfinn Føllesdal, "Husserl on Evidence and Justification," in *Edmund Husserl and the Phenomenological Tradition*, ed. Robert Sokolowski (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1988), 107-129.

¹⁰ Ülker Öktem, "Husserl's Evidence Problem," *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology* 9, no. 1 (2009): 5.

“explicating more precisely the sense of a grounding or that of a cognition, we come forthwith to the idea of *evidence*.”¹¹ In CM, Husserl lays down the so-called “first methodological principle,” which organizes his scientific project and which postulates that “genuine science, must neither make or go on accepting any judgment as scientific *that I have not derived from evidence*, from ‘experiences’ in which the affairs and affair-complexes in question are present to me as ‘they themselves.’”¹² But a similar version of this principle was already in operation earlier in *Ideas I*. There, Husserl referred to the “Principle of All Principles,” which stipulates that

*every originary presentive intuition is a legitimizing source of cognition, that everything originarily [...] offered to us in “intuition” is to be accepted simply as what it is presented as being, but also only within the limits in which it is presented there. We see indeed that each <theory> can only again draw its truth itself from originary [sic.] data. Every statement [...] conforming to them is [...] actually an absolute beginning called upon to serve as foundation, a principium in the genuine sense of the word.*¹³

“Evidence” is therefore implicit in the notion of laying a foundation for legitimizing knowledge, and this laying serves as a principled *beginning* for the entire philosophical endeavor. It is, in other words, associated with the very act of *beginning to philosophize*. (NB: Heidegger repeatedly connects fundamental moods [*Grundstimmungen*] with the beginning of philosophy.) In CM, Husserl explicitly connects apodictic evidence with the beginning of philosophy. As he writes:

In accordance with what has already been said, we now formulate, as an initial definite question of beginning philosophy, the question whether it is possible for us to bring out evidences that, on the one hand, carry with them – as we now must say: apodictically – the insight that, as “first in themselves,” they precede all other imaginable evidences and, on the other hand, can be seen to be themselves apodictic. If they should turn out to be inadequate, they would have to possess at least a recognizable apodictic content, they would have to give us some being that is firmly secured “once for all,” or absolutely, by virtue of their apodicticity.¹⁴

In his article “Apodictic Evidence” (2001), Hans Bernhard Schmid breaks up Husserl’s work from 1900 to 1936 into five major stages, and claims that “Husserl’s concern with ‘evidence’ remains more or less on the same level of intensity throughout his work.”¹⁵ In this context, “apodicticity” becomes more important in the course of the development of Husserl’s thought, its role peaking in the CM. Indeed, in his later works, after the 1920s, Husserl distances himself from his earlier thinking on “evidence,” which was based on the ideal of adequation, and accords primacy to “apodicticity,” a notion he had not paid attention to earlier.

Husserl’s analysis of “evidence” in CM typifies his revised position on evidence and his shift from adequation to apodicticity. In §5, entitled “Evidence and the idea of genuine science,” Husserl defines evidence thus: “Evidence is, in an *extremely broad sense* [...] a mental seeing of something itself.”¹⁶ And: “*Perfect evidence* and its correlate, *pure and genuine truth*, are given as ideas lodged in the striving for knowledge, for fulfilment of one’s meaning intention.”¹⁷ Further on, in §6, he clarifies that the idea of “perfection” corresponds to that of “*adequate evidence*,” and so it is the idea that replaces the older normative notion of adequacy, which is no longer an achievable ideal. On the contrary, this “perfection,” called “apodicticity,” can occur even in evidence that is inadequate.

¹¹ Edmund Husserl, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*, trans. F. Kersten (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1983).

¹² *Ibid.*, 14.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 44.

¹⁴ Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, trans. Dorion Cairns (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1982), 16.

¹⁵ Hans Bernhard Schmid, “Apodictic Evidence,” *Husserl Studies* 17, no. 3 (2001): 223.

¹⁶ Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations*, 12.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

Apodictic evidence, according to Husserl, “is not merely certainty of the affairs or affair-complexes (states-of-affairs) evident in it; rather it [has the] peculiarity of being *at the same time the absolute unimaginableness* (inconceivability) of their *non-being*, and thus excluding in advance every doubt as ‘objectless,’ empty.”¹⁸

The principle of apodicticity is based on the principle of non-contradiction, something that, as I will argue later, is incompatible with Heidegger’s own epistemology, since one of the things that Heidegger’s ontology tries to do is precisely to overcome the metaphysics of the principle of non-contradiction.

1.2. Evidence is *Not* a Feeling

Husserl’s positive characterization of evidence is accompanied by his protestation against any association of evidence with feeling. In *Logical Investigations* (LI) and *Ideas I* (and elsewhere), Husserl spends considerable energy opposing the notion of the “feeling of evidence.” As Heffernan notes, while it is common knowledge that Husserl attempts, both in his early and his late work, to provide a positive answer to the problem of “evidence,” initially by claiming it to be the experience of truth, then by asserting that evidence is the “intentional achievement of self-givenness,” it is not common knowledge that “both the early Husserl and the mature Husserl also repeatedly take the *via negativa* by denying that ‘evidence’ is a ‘feeling’ (‘Gefühl’).”¹⁹

For Husserl, the conception of “evidence” as a feeling is an outcome of psychologistic, positivist, conceptions of the ego cogito, for which evidence of truth, i.e. the experience of truth, *has* to register in a psychological way. But for him feelings are unsuitable for bridging the gap between immanence and transcendence not only because feelings are subjective but also because feelings denote a psychological phenomenon. Feelings cannot constitute evidence for the experience of truth, and the irreducible contrast between the position that evidence is the experience of truth and the position that evidence is some kind of feeling, a psychological phenomenon, that accompanies truth is, as Heffernan notes, “a leitmotif of Husserl’s attempt to provide an adequate account of the epistemic phenomenon of evidence.”²⁰

As already noted, Husserl’s opposition to conceptualizing evidence in terms of a feeling is found throughout his writings, traversing his entire corpus. For example, in LI, Husserl explicitly rejects the idea of evidence as feeling because, he says, feelings accompany acts of judgment only accidentally.²¹ In *Introduction to Logic and Theory of Knowledge*, Husserl argues that an indispensable step in the process of defining “evidence” (*Evidenz*) is the necessity of overcoming the view that evidence is a “feeling” (*Gefühl*); and in *The Idea of Phenomenology*, Husserl offers another critique of the view that evidence is a “feeling” or an “index” of some kind.²² In *Ideas I*, Husserl argues that we cannot make sense of “evidence” (*Evidenz*) in terms of a “feeling” (*Gefühl*) or a “feeling of evidence” (*Evidenzgefühl*) that involves some sort of “index of truth” (*Index veri*). In *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, Husserl argues once again that “evidence” (*Evidenz*) is not at all a matter of “so-called feelings of evidence” (*sogenannte Evidenzgefühle*).

This is consistent with Husserl’s overarching thesis that feeling comprises a distinct category of act, an emotional act, which is *founded* on an act of presenting (*Vorstellen*), and which therefore cannot form the ground of phenomenology.

¹⁸ Ibid., 15–16.

¹⁹ Heffernan, “Study in the Sedimented Origins of Evidence,” 83.

²⁰ George Heffernan, “An Essay in Epistemic Kuklophobia: Husserl’s Critique of Descartes’ Conception of Evidence,” *Husserl Studies* 13 (1997): 84.

²¹ Ibid., 85.

²² Ibid., 86.

2. Heidegger's Critique of Husserlian "Evidence"

Heidegger's most sustained and systematic critique of Husserl's conception of the notion of "evidence" is found in his lecture course *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* (IPR), delivered in the winter semester 1923/24.²³ In this lecture course, Heidegger compares and contrasts Husserlian phenomenology with Cartesian philosophy and zeroes in on the basic differences, but also—crucially—what he sees as the common tendency in their philosophical endeavors, what Heidegger calls the "care for certainty." This tendency, which Husserl inherits from Descartes, is responsible for an array of characteristics that influence Husserl's transcendental phenomenology vis-à-vis the conception of phenomenology as a science and connected methodological considerations. Specifically, the "care for certainty," which organizes both Descartes' and Husserl's work, is responsible for the normative ideals of "certainty" and "evidence" operative in Husserl's phenomenology.

In this section, I will set out Heidegger's critique of Husserl's conception of "evidence" in three parts, proceeding from the general to the particular. In part one, I will explain how, according to Heidegger, Husserl's phenomenology inherits the Cartesian vision of science, the essence of which is the "care for certainty." As a consequence, the ideal of science is that of *security*. This stems from a care for already known knowledge, which imposes a need for purification that weeds out the uncertain in order to achieve certainty. In part two, I will explain how the aforementioned scientific ideal, results in the respective themes of the "cogito" and "consciousness" as the areas of being that remain available after the criteria of truth (clarity and distinctness) are put in place.²⁴ In part three, I will explain how, according to Heidegger, care for certainty results in Husserl mangling phenomenological findings and focusing on intentionality, emotional life, and "evidence".

2.1. Care for Certainty: Science, Knowledge and Purification

IPR is a lecture course ultimately dedicated to identifying what went wrong in Husserl's "transcendental turn," in Heidegger's eyes, and to preparing the ground for Heidegger's own transcendental project, which has the existential analytic of Dasein as its centerpiece. Ultimately, Heidegger will want to change the thematic field of phenomenology: from consciousness to the meaning of Being. It is in this context that Heidegger says that the course is "supposed to be nothing less than a *proper preparation for the critical encounter with what is set forth as the thematic field in present-day phenomenology.*"²⁵ Heidegger analyzes the ways the Husserlian promise of a phenomenological *science* ultimately succumbs to the Cartesian ideal of certainty, and shows that Husserl betrays his initial phenomenological discoveries as laid down in LI. Heidegger's critical analysis is here mainly focused on *Ideas to a Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy* and on "Philosophy as a Rigorous Science."

Heidegger is quite careful not to conflate Husserlian terms with Cartesian notions, and he repeats several times that, for example, Husserlian "consciousness" should not be conflated with the Cartesian "cogito."²⁶ However, "a common character obtains in spite of the difference in decisive connections, a common character such that it becomes apparent how Husserl, in spite of the difference, stands within the uniform, basic tendency of Cartesian research, in such a way that in him the care of knowledge is ultimately at work as *care about certainty.*"²⁷

Science, as an expression of the care for certainty, has the task of *securing* not just knowledge but, as Heidegger argues, existence and culture.²⁸ It is this care for security that turns the care about

²³ Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, trans. Daniel O. Dahlstrom (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005).

²⁴ *clara et distincta perception*

²⁵ Heidegger, *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, 198–9.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 44.

absolute knowledge into epistemological security, that is, justified knowledge [*gerechtfertigte Erkenntnis*].²⁹ According to Heidegger, the care for certainty means there is no tolerance for uncertainty, and this allows for the prioritization of methodology over the matter itself, and the reverse: the idea of a definite sort of knowledge determines the theme, rather than vice versa.³⁰ In this way, consciousness becomes the theme of phenomenological research. Yet consciousness is still in need of a further *purification (Reinigung)*.³¹ As mentioned earlier, the rigorousness of the natural sciences serves as the ultimate example of rigorousness. But Husserl wants consciousness, which is the theme of his philosophy, to be further purified, so as to “bring the scientific bias to natural science radically to end,”³² because the scientific bias may make the acquisition of absolute certainty impossible (since all the claims of *natural science* may be doubted). It is this purification that the transcendental reduction achieves.³³

For Heidegger, the purification process enacted by the transcendental reduction (and the epoché) leaves out human existence (Dasein) and temporality, and his own existential analytic of Dasein tries to remedy this. In Heidegger’s own words: “The question remains: What, then, is neglected? In this care about the absolute certitude of the norm and, at the same time, about elaborating a genuine lawfulness, the task of examining human existence itself does not come up at all. [...] *What is neglected is what is the genuine object of concern: human existence.*”³⁴

One could insist that it is the process of purification that differentiates Husserlian consciousness from the Cartesian cogito, insofar as the former project is transcendental whereas the latter is not. Heidegger would agree; however, he insists that despite the irreducible difference, the Husserlian reduction is still in line with the Cartesian project of achieving certainty by the predominance of epistemology directed at already known knowledge. As we will now see in more detail, in the care for certainty, the epistemological criteria that determine truth are *clarity* and *distinctness*.

2.2. Criteria for Truth: Clarity and Distinctness

According to Heidegger, the “method in connection with the care for certitude is [...] taken in a completely determined sense: as the path to the acquisition of the greatest possible *evidence*.”³⁵ But how is evidence defined? As mentioned earlier, Descartes’ justification of the criterion of knowledge is connected to his definition of truth as *clear and distinct perception*. So how does Descartes determine *clarity* and *distinctness*, which are the characteristics by virtue of which one encounters the truth (*verum*)?

Perception must firstly be clear and then distinct. As Heidegger says, the “perceptum is such that it is grasped by a manner of *grasping explicitly* aimed at it, by a *mens attendens* [mind attending] to the sort of grasping that is at work where the aim is to get a hold of what is to be grasped in itself.”³⁶ The perceptum must be there *present* and *exposed*.³⁷ Heidegger interprets it thus: the perceptum must in any case be “*lying there in the open*, the entity existing there in itself, such that it is in no way concealed, is not indirectly given itself.”³⁸ In other words: it must be there fully present. Remember that this is how Husserl also defined evidence in *Ideas I*. According to the Principle of All Principles, in *originary intuition* thought and thing coincide, and this coincidence is what constitutes evidence, what constitutes fulfillment and presence, what guarantees presence.

²⁹ Ibid., 73.

³⁰ Ibid., 34.

³¹ Ibid., 38.

³² Ibid., 53.

³³ Ibid., 58.

³⁴ Ibid., 66.

³⁵ Ibid., 92.

³⁶ Ibid., 154–5.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

But even clarity is not enough on its own for true perception—we also need distinctness, which is an added condition: while there are some clear perceptions that are not distinct, there are no distinct perceptions that are not clear, since “distinctness is a factor founded on the clarity.”³⁹ Heidegger takes note of Descartes’ example of a clear but non-distinct perception: non-localized pain. “If someone feels a great pain, then he has the pain as existing and has it in an absolutely clear but not always distinct way. [...] Here, to be sure, the pain is given in an absolutely clear way, but it is not given distinctly.”⁴⁰ It is important to take note of this example, because it shows that Heideggerian moods (*Stimmungen*) would not fulfill the Cartesian (and Husserlian) criteria for evidence, since moods, like pain, are not distinct, even though they are present.

Another way to see clarity and distinctness is to see them as determinate and self-identical *presence*, which is reliant not only on simple perception but also on comprehension. Evidence is the bringing together of what is meant and what is grasped in itself, and this coincidence is normatively determined by indisputability and disputability, i.e. by the principle of contradiction, which also organizes Husserl’s notion of apodicticity.

2.3. The Mangling of Intentionality, Emotional Life, and Evidence

Despite the differences between Husserl and Descartes, Heidegger argues, their philosophies share the same tendency: the care for certainty. In trying to fight historicism and achieve his transcendental turn, Husserl adopts the Cartesian tendency (the care for certainty) and betrays his most important phenomenological discoveries. Heidegger becomes very critical of the transcendental turn, as he believes it mangles his earlier fundamental phenomenological discoveries. For the purpose of this essay, it is crucial to mention three intermingled ways in which—according to Heidegger—Husserl mangles phenomenology: intentionality, emotional life, and evidence.

As regards intentionality, Husserl’s care for certainty distorts his initial discovery of intentionality in the following way. Intentionality is always—either explicitly or implicitly—construed as a specific *theoretical* behavior, and it is characteristically translated as meaning, intending something [*Meinen*], i.e. *theoretically knowing* something.⁴¹ This way of interpreting intentionality distorts the intentional *life* of a subject; for example, it obscures the way intentionality itself is permeated by feeling. Husserl’s reflective method devivifies intentional life, posing the problem of the constitution of intentional life in a way that suppresses (and distorts) the vital grounds of this life. Heidegger is interested in showing how intentional life—intentionality in all its forms and variations—is grounded in the affective. It is in this context that Heidegger begins his analysis of intentional life, by prioritizing the enactment [*Vollzug*] of life. Intentional life *is* enactment, a praxis that is affectively determined.

Husserl’s care for certainty fixes his gaze in such a way that his analysis prefigures intentionality as theoretical knowing. As Heidegger writes:

Through this fixing of usage, a definite prefiguration of perspective creeps into every intentional analysis. This is explicitly evident from the fact that it is expressly claimed that for every intentional context of a complicated sort, theoretically meaning something forms the foundation, that each judgment, each instance of wanting, each instance of loving is founded upon a presenting [*Vorstellen*] that provides in advance what can be wanted, what is detestable and loveable. This transformation lies in the fact that the prevailing study of intentionality is itself oriented to the intentional in knowing.⁴²

As a consequence, Husserl’s analysis also distorts emotional acts themselves (for example, an act of loving), which are reduced to acts of theoretical knowing and taken to be founded on presenting [*Vorstellen*]. According to Heidegger, however, it is “a methodical misunderstanding to make the

³⁹ Ibid., 156.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid., 209.

⁴² Ibid.

investigation of emotional experiences simply analogous to knowing.”⁴³ The distortion that takes place here, a distortion that is a basic phenomenon of the care for certainty, is a phenomenon determined as *reflection*. Recall that for Husserl, it is phenomenological reflection that is the secure source of evidence. Following the epoché, the source of authority for knowledge is, according to the Principle of All Principles, *originary intuition*, in which thought and thing coincide, and this coincidence is what constitutes evidence, fulfillment and presence. But for Heidegger, it is precisely reflection that *distorts*; it distorts affective phenomena such as anxiety, joy, terror, etc. In Heidegger’s words:

This basic phenomenon of distorting, a basic phenomenon that has long been determined as reflection, is seen here concretely and, indeed, in terms of a preview of the structure of existence’s being as such. For us this phenomenon has the character of a methodic clue, insofar as, viewed from its vantage point, the basic character of consciousness, the *intentionality*, is cut down to size and led back to its limits, to the *limits of its interpretative function*. At the same time this phenomenon is the structural ground on which such phenomena as joy, terror, sadness, anxiety can be explicated—phenomena that are overlooked if they are determined as intentionality. I cannot grasp the phenomenon of anxiety as a manner of being-related-to-something; it is instead a phenomenon of existence itself.⁴⁴

This distortion of affective phenomena is key to understanding why for Heidegger they provide evidence of truth and authenticity whereas Husserl suppresses, ignores, or entirely dismisses their evidentiary value (remember his sustained critique of *Evidenzgefühl*). As a result, Husserl misinterprets the notion of *evidence*.

Heidegger notes that evidence plays a fundamental role in phenomenology and that what Husserl says about evidence “is far superior to everything else that has ever been said about it and that he has placed the matter on a suitable basis for the first time.”⁴⁵ Evidence is interpreted as coincidence of what is meant and what is grasped in itself, and “evidence itself is normatively determined by indisputability and disputability, analogous to the way the cogito sum is normatively determined by the principle of contradiction.”⁴⁶

Evidence is therefore “a *specific sort of evidence for grasping and determining*, a specific sort of evidence that is transposed, by way of analogy, to the remaining manners of behavior and their evidence. It is transposed in such a way that Husserl sees that each object-domain, corresponding to its inherent content, has a specific sort of evidence.”⁴⁷ According to Heidegger, Husserl’s phenomenology, just like Descartes’ philosophy, “has also been *guided by the predominance of an empty and thereby fantastic idea of certainty and evidence*. This predominance of a specific idea of evidence predominates over every genuine effort to free up the possibility of encountering the genuine matters of philosophy. Care about a specific, absolute knowledge, taken purely as an idea, predominates over every question about the matters that are decisive.”⁴⁸

3. Feeling and Evidence in *Being and Time*

BT is famous for the methodological role it ascribes to the fundamental mood (*Grundstimmung*) of *Angst*: it is the mood that motivates Dasein to become authentic; it is the mood that reveals to Dasein its lostness in the “they” and that releases Dasein to an authentic Being-towards-death.⁴⁹ A lot has

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 220.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 210.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 33.

⁴⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 311.

been written about the role of moods in Heidegger's philosophy, and more needs to be done in order to illuminate this complex phenomenon.⁵⁰ In this section, I will only focus on the evidentiary role of moods in BT, and my account is by no means exhaustive, but rather fills some gaps as regards the way Heidegger's account of moods constitutes a challenge to Husserlian phenomenology when it comes to the problem of evidence.

3.1. Being-In: Disposition, Understanding and the World

In BT, Heidegger provides an "existential analytic of Dasein," in which he describes and interprets the constitutive states of Dasein qua Being-in-the-world. The ultimate aim of the book is to lay open the horizon of Dasein's understanding of Being. Heidegger analyzes how Dasein understands Being and how Dasein is the site of the truth of Being. Heidegger sees Dasein as *in* truth—Dasein understands the truth of Being, even though most of the time it covers up this understanding with inauthentic misinterpretation. Insofar as Dasein is in truth, this means that Dasein's own way of being must "contain" evidence of truth, even amid the inauthentic edifices—hence, the evidentiary operation of Dasein's basic existential structure must be analyzed.

In this context, Heidegger identifies two equiprimordial ways that the "there" of Dasein is constituted: "disposition" (*Befindlichkeit*) and "understanding" (*Verstehen*).⁵¹ Equiprimordiality means that disposition always has its understanding, even if it merely keeps it suppressed, and understanding always has its mood.⁵² Disposition refers to the affective character of Dasein, the way it finds itself thrown in the world, which is manifested in moods.

Heidegger's twofold description of Being-In (-the-world) goes against traditional cognitive-based interpretations of human understanding, which grasp it in a theoretical, detached way. According to Heidegger, "the phenomenon of Being-in has for the most part been represented exclusively by a single exemplar – knowing the world,"⁵³ which is a derivative mode of Being-in-the-world. Here, Heidegger is going against not only Descartes but also Husserlian reflective knowing (see what was said above about the mangling of intentionality).

To begin with, Heidegger dismisses the idea that Dasein is ever without a mood. As he says, even the "pallid, evenly balanced lack of mood [*Ungestimmtheit*], which is often persistent and which is not to be mistaken for a bad mood, is far from nothing at all."⁵⁴ Even in this seeming "lack of mood," its being-there has already been disclosed in a particular way: as a burden. The "lack of mood" discloses the burdensome character of Dasein's facticity, which is a basic character of its being that "we cannot come across by beholding it [*Anschau*en]." Mood is therefore that by virtue of which facticity is revealed.⁵⁵

Mood "brings Dasein before itself," and through mood Dasein "finds itself" in a peculiar way, which extends beyond the scope or capacities of perception: mood discloses not in the way of "looking" but in "turning towards or turning away" (*An- und Ab-kehr*).⁵⁶ In other words, the way mood reveals the truth of Dasein's being is neither the way perception grasps a phenomenon that is

⁵⁰ For pertinent recent discussions of affectivity in *Being and Time*, see Andreas Elpidorou and Lauren Freeman, "Affectivity in Heidegger I: Moods and Emotions in *Being and Time*," *Philosophy Compass* 10, no. 10 (2015): 661–71; Lauren Freeman, "Toward a Phenomenology of Mood," *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 52, no. 4 (2014): 445–76; Katherine Withy, "The Methodological Role of Angst in *Being and Time*," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 43, no. 2 (2012): 195–211.

⁵¹ While Macquarrie and Robinson translate *Befindlichkeit* as "state-of-mind," I opt for "disposition," for reasons that I explain in Christos Hadjioannou, *The Emergence of Mood in Heidegger's Phenomenology* (PhD diss., University of Sussex, 2015). For another discussion of how to translate *Befindlichkeit*, see: Elpidorou and Freeman, "Affectivity in Heidegger I," 661–71.

⁵² Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 182.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 86.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 173.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 174.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

present-at-hand, nor the way a valid judgment reveals something true, but the way in which one directs oneself either toward something or away from something as either pleasing or displeasing. The structure of moods' way of disclosing corresponds to the dynamic ground ascribed to the disclosure of judgment by Rickert, for whom judgment is not a disinterested affair but rather something passionate that involves either the affirmation or the denial of a value.

Disposition, for Heidegger, discloses Being-in-the-world as a whole, because it discloses significance itself; it discloses the way the world *matters*, the way the world is organized as a meaningful whole. Because of disposition's power to disclose, Heidegger's analytic takes affects very seriously: it is, in his own words, "methodologically significant in principle for the existential analytic."⁵⁷ Disposition discloses the world qua world—that is, it discloses the world as possibility. Specifically, it discloses the "world" as "a totality of involvements," a "categorical whole of a *possible* interconnection of the ready-to-hand."⁵⁸

Let us unpack Heidegger's thesis by way of reference to fear (*Furcht*). Dasein encounters things and the world itself *circumspectively*. Dasein does not just sense something or stare at it; rather, it is circumspectively concerned with it, and it becomes affected by it in some way (*Betroffenwerdens*).⁵⁹ The fact that something affects Dasein in a determinate way, the fact that something *matters* to Dasein, comes down to its having a disposition. For example, as Heidegger writes, "only something which is in the disposition of fearing (or fearlessness) can discover that what is environmentally ready-to-hand is threatening. Dasein's openness to the world is constituted existentially by the attunement of a disposition."⁶⁰ And later on: "Circumspection sees the fearsome because it has fear as its disposition. Fearing, as a slumbering possibility of Being-in-the-world in a disposition (we call this possibility 'fearfulness' [*Furchtsamkeit*]), has already disclosed the world, in that out of it something like the fearsome may come close."⁶¹ Fear itself, therefore, has already organized the world in a particular way, but it has also *revealed* the world in such a way that if one were to thematize said disposition, it would serve as a clue, as evidence, for knowledge of the world.

3.2. Heidegger's Alternative Epistemology: Affective Evidence vs Intuitive Evidence

As I have been arguing, Heidegger's ontological rehabilitation of affect involves a radicalization of the very notion of evidence, of what counts as evidence for the truth of Being and ontological structures. His claim that moods are ontological evidence involves a methodological radicalization of phenomenology itself, *contra* Husserl. That Heidegger is opposed to Husserl in this way is clear from the premises of his analysis of moods and the way the latter contrast with Husserlian epistemological criteria. In particular, Heidegger's rehabilitation of moods involves a—sometimes tacit, sometimes explicit—juxtaposition of affective evidence with the Cartesian/Husserlian criteria of clarity and distinction, the certainty of reflection and (phenomenological/originary) intuition, the normative determinations of indisputability, and the principle of non-contradiction. The Cartesian/Husserlian epistemological criteria delimit ontological discoveries; hence, a breakthrough involving those criteria would radicalize the ontological findings, would enable ontology to move beyond "Being as presence" or to forget the question of Being altogether. For example, in BT, Heidegger argues that "the absolute 'Being-certain' [*Gewissen*] of the *cogito* exempted [Descartes] from raising the question of the meaning of the Being which [Dasein] possesses."⁶² Lest we forget, Heidegger held that

⁵⁷ Ibid., 178–9

⁵⁸ Ibid., 184

⁵⁹ Ibid., 176.

⁶⁰ Ibid. (translation modified).

⁶¹ Ibid., 180 (translation modified).

⁶² Ibid., 46.

Husserl's phenomenology, just like Descartes' inquiry, is "guided by the predominance of an empty and thereby fantastic idea of certainty and evidence."⁶³

"Every inquiry," Heidegger argues, "is a seeking [*Suchen*]. Every seeking gets guided beforehand by what is sought."⁶⁴ Phenomenology lets us see

something that proximally and for the most part does *not* show itself at all: it is something that lies *hidden*, in contrast to that which proximally and for the most part does show itself. [...] Yet that which remains *hidden* in an egregious sense, or which relapses and gets *covered up* again, or which shows itself only "*in disguise*," is not just this entity or that, but rather the *Being* of entities, as our previous observations have shown.⁶⁵

Unlike in Husserl's phenomenology, Heidegger's phenomenology reveals moods, existential feelings, as evidence for Dasein's facticity and the understanding of the meaning of Being.

In *Ideas I*, Husserl establishes phenomenological inquiry on the evidence provided by originary intuition, following the epoché. Heidegger wants to overthrow this reflective beginning; he wants another methodological beginning, one that takes pre-reflective evidence of moods as a vantage point and that allows the phenomenologist to *see past the objects of intuition* and take affective movement as evidence of ontological understanding. But the affective beginning on the basis of the evidence supplied by *Angst* is *analogous* to the Husserlian departure from originary intuition, because it serves the same methodological function. As Heidegger writes:

The way in which Being and its structures are encountered in the mode of phenomenon is one which must first of all be *wrested* from the objects of phenomenology. Thus the very *point of departure* [*Ausgang*] for our analysis requires that it be secured by the proper method, just as much as does our *access* [*Zugang*] to the phenomenon, or our *passage* [*Durchgang*] through whatever is prevalently covering it up. The idea of grasping and explicating phenomena in a way which is "original" and "intuitive" [*originären* and *intuitiven*] is directly opposed to the *naïveté* of a haphazard, "immediate," and unreflective "beholding" [*Schauen*].⁶⁶

Heidegger repeatedly juxtaposes the kind of evidence supplied by *Angst* with the kind of evidence supplied by the apodictic certainty of theoretical cognition—a clear, albeit implicit, reference to Husserl's apodictic certainty of phenomenological reflection. For example, Heidegger writes: "From the existential-ontological point of view, there is not the slightest justification for minimizing what is 'evident' in dispositions, by measuring it against apodictic certainty of a theoretical cognition of something which is purely present-at-hand."⁶⁷

Moods are pre-reflective, and hence what they disclose and the way they disclose it precedes the range of disclosure of "cognition" and "volition": "ontologically mood is a primordial kind of Being for Dasein, in which Dasein is disclosed to itself *prior* to all cognition and volition, and *beyond* their range of disclosure."⁶⁸ In a sense, then, *one needs to set the bar "lower" in order to enable the pre-reflective understanding of Being to become evident*. Moods are normally taken to *distort* understanding rather than to be constitutive of it; they are seen as leading one to err, as factors of instability and uncertainty, and therefore they are taken not to count as evidence for knowledge, since knowledge is associated with certainty. What is missed is the positive evidentiary capacity of moods, since the criterion—apodictic certainty—is associated with indisputable, clear and distinct presence. At the same time, this covers up the ontological value of delusion, since truth is an issue of universal validity and permanent presence, instead of a hermeneutic interplay of presence and absence. As Heidegger writes:

⁶³ Heidegger, *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, 33.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 59.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 175 (translation modified).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

The fact that, even though dispositions are primarily disclosive, everyday circumspection goes wrong and to a large extent succumbs to delusion because of them, is a $\mu\eta\ \delta\upsilon\nu$ [non-being] when measured against the idea of knowing the “world” absolutely. But if we make evaluations which are so unjustified ontologically, we shall completely fail to recognize the existentially positive character of the capacity for delusion. It is precisely when we see the “world” unsteadily and fitfully in accordance with our moods, that the ready-to-hand shows itself in its specific worldhood, which is never the same from day to day.⁶⁹

3.3. Angst: The Authentic Certainty of Resoluteness

Throughout this essay, I have depicted both Husserl’s and Heidegger’s projects as aiming to establish a firm footing for phenomenological findings by setting normative epistemological standards according to which their phenomenological findings will be grounded in evidence. Their aim is to ensure that their phenomenological findings are justified. In this context, Husserl devises the Principle of All Principles, which purifies consciousness and guarantees that phenomenological reflection provides *evidence* for transcendental knowledge. Here, evidence is identified with self-giveness, with clarity and distinction, which can supply the necessary (apodictic) certainty. In this context, Husserl absolutely rejects the idea that feelings have anything to do with evidence. Heidegger rejects Husserl’s methodological position. His own normative criterion is “resoluteness.” The notion of resoluteness provides a different answer to the question of what can provide certainty and evidence, and in this context Heidegger argues that Angst, which is an existential feeling, provides the ultimate evidence.

For Heidegger, *resoluteness* is an existential (“*existentiell*”) possibility for Dasein that attests to Dasein’s authentic potentiality-for-Being.⁷⁰ Dasein’s authentic potentiality-for-Being is a phenomenon grounded in *anticipation*, which amounts to Dasein’s authentic potentiality-for-Being-a-whole, i.e. Dasein’s authentic Being-towards-death. In being resolute, Dasein authentically anticipates its own death. What is the significance of death? What does anticipating it achieve, and why is it important? Heidegger defines death thus: “*death, as the end of Dasein, is Dasein’s ownmost possibility—non-relational, certain and as such indefinite, not to be outstripped. Death is, as Dasein’s end, in the Being of this entity towards its end.*”⁷¹ What does resoluteness therefore achieve? On the one hand, in anticipatory resoluteness “*temporality gets experienced in a phenomenally primordial way*” and is a distinctive mode of temporality that brings Dasein “before the primordial *truth* of existence.”⁷² On the other hand, it achieves *certainty*. The attainment of certainty is key, and we need to analyze it further.

How does resoluteness achieve certainty? Resoluteness involves the reticent “projecting oneself upon one’s ownmost Being-guilty, and *exacting anxiety of oneself.*”⁷³ Insofar as resoluteness involves the attainment of certainty, and this certainty is achieved by “exacting anxiety,” *it follows that anxiety is the evidence that grounds the knowledge involved in the truth of resoluteness.* What remains to be answered, now, is the question of how this certainty differs from Husserlian apodictic certainty, and what counts as evidence for it.

In BT, Heidegger distinguishes between authentic certainty and inauthentic certainty, each of which involves maintaining oneself in the truth that has been revealed. The immediate truth that has been revealed in Being-towards-death is the death of Dasein: Dasein is certain of its own death. Inauthentic certainty of death involves an inauthentic way of encountering the event of death, which involves the expectation of a future event as a *matter of fact*. This is inauthentic certainty because it maintains itself in the truth of an event present-at-hand in an indifferent, “purely objective” manner—much like the empirical certainty of apodictic evidence, whereby a truth is disclosed as certain

⁶⁹ Ibid., 177 (translation modified).

⁷⁰ Ibid., 349.

⁷¹ Ibid., 301.

⁷² Ibid., 307.

⁷³ Ibid., 305 (my italics).

because its opposite is logically inconceivable. Authentic certainty, on the other hand, is another kind of certainty, the certainty of *Being-certain*, which is more primordial, and for which *Angst* is the primary evidence. In Heidegger's own words:

To maintain oneself in this truth—that is, to be certain of what has been disclosed—demands all the more that one should anticipate. We cannot compute the certainty of death by ascertaining how many cases of death we encounter. This certainty is by no means of the kind which maintains itself in the truth of the present-at-hand. When something present-at-hand has been uncovered, it is encountered most purely if we just look at the entity and let it be encountered in itself. Dasein must first have lost itself in the factual circumstances [*Sachverhalte*] (this can be one of care's own tasks and possibilities) if it is to obtain the pure objectivity—that is to say, the indifference—of apodictic evidence. If Being-certain in relation to death does not have this character, this does not mean that it is of a lower grade, but that *it does not belong at all to the graded order of the kinds of evidence we can have about the present-at-hand.*⁷⁴

To maintain oneself in the truth of authentic certainty, therefore—what Heidegger calls “Being-certain”—Dasein ought to rely on a different sort of evidence, rather than rely on the reflection of the apodictic reduction: it must rely on *Angst*. *Angst* is evidence for the understanding of death as a possibility, which is the “possibility of impossibility of existence.”⁷⁵

It takes a lot of courage to accept *Angst* as evidence—a courage that “they” will not let Dasein have. In fact, the “‘they’ concerns itself with transforming this anxiety into fear in the face of an oncoming event. In addition, the anxiety which has been made ambiguous as fear, is passed off as a weakness with which no self-assured Dasein may have any acquaintance”⁷⁶ and is thus banished from the epistemological frame.

Heidegger's rehabilitation of moods, of existential feeling, radicalizes the notion of certainty, but also the notion of evidence. In BT, *Angst* is the ultimate evidence of the authentic understanding of the meaning of Being. In Heidegger's words:

All understanding is accompanied by a disposition. Dasein's mood brings it face to face with the thrownness of its “that it is there.” *But the disposition which can hold open the utter and constant threat to itself arising from Dasein's ownmost individualized Being, is anxiety.* In this disposition, Dasein finds itself *face to face* with the “nothing” of the possible impossibility of its existence. Anxiety is anxious *about* the potentiality-for-Being of the entity so destined [*des so bestimmten Seienden*], and in this way it discloses the uttermost possibility.⁷⁷

What does Heidegger's radicalization of the notion of “evidence” amount to? What are its epistemological consequences? What sort of epistemic criteria are put in place if we treat existential feeling, which is a phenomenon far from clear and distinct, as a measure? These are difficult questions, and a separate study would be needed in order to address them. But allow me to draw some preliminary conclusions. To begin with, Heidegger rejects the idea of disinterested, passion-free judgment, or disinterested understanding. As a consequence, any “evidence” must have an affective dimension. “Evidence” *feels like* something. Affective evidence, however, cannot be measured in the same way as the apodictic certainty of reflection. Affective evidence shows that truth and justification is grounded in facticity—this is precisely what moods are. Facticity is a fundamental phenomenon of existence, which is not given in reason, but rather is a *burden (Last)* to reason and understanding.⁷⁸ Disposition, mood, orients and motivates understanding,⁷⁹ but it also delimits understanding *whilst*

⁷⁴ Ibid., 309–10.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 307.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 298.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 310 (translation modified).

⁷⁸ *Being and Time*, Macquarrie and Robinson, p. 174 (SZ, 134).

⁷⁹ In certain respects, moods can be said to be the “desire” that motivates understanding, even though moods cannot be reduced to “desire” and it would be a mistake to use desire here, since desire in modern and post-Kantian philosophy became associated with the striving subject. Let it be noted, however, that in his earlier accounts of how affective phenomena accompany understanding, Heidegger sometimes uses the word desire [*Begehren*]. What is more, in lectures preceding the

enabling it. Mood is always a *burden* to understanding, a burden it necessarily bears and can never shake off. It is a puzzle that constantly confuses understanding, an ever-present aporia that makes understanding understand its own limits. As such, affective evidence, especially Angst, is evidence of Dasein's rational finitude, the absence of an ultimate rational and self-transparent foundation (ground) and of universal, transhistorical criteria.

Angst is evidence that the familiar, everyday, and tranquil is radically ungrounded. Angst is evidence of the (certainty of) uncanny uncertainty, which constitutes the world/existence—of the radical ungroundedness of Dasein's ground. In fact, if Heidegger is to show—phenomenologically—that the ground of Dasein's Being is the Nothing, i.e. the absence of such ground, he needs to take Angst as evidence.

publication of BT, Heidegger explicitly associates the phenomenological notion of *intentionality* (which was the Brentanian concept that allowed for the emergence of phenomenology) with *ὄρεξις* (desire).