

<https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2020.04.091>  
УДК 130.1

**Andrii LEONOV**, Master of Philosophy,  
Doctoral Student at the Department of Philosophy,  
School of Humanities,  
Rice University,  
MS 14, P.O. Box 1892, Houston, Texas, 77251-1892, United States  
[andrii.leonov@rice.edu](mailto:andrii.leonov@rice.edu)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4174-9734>

## THE MIND-BODY PROBLEM(S) IN DESCARTES' "MEDITATIONS" AND HUSSERL'S "CRISIS" (Part 1)

---

*The main topic of this paper is the mind-body problem. The author analyzes it in the context of Husserlian phenomenology. The key texts for the analysis and interpretation are Descartes' magnum opus "Meditations on the First Philosophy" and Husserl's last work "The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology". The author claims that already in Descartes' text instead of one mind-body problem, one can find two: the ontological mind-body problem (mind-brain relation) and conceptual one ("mind" and "body" as concepts). In Descartes' "Meditations", the ontological level is explicit, while the conceptual level is implicit. In Husserl's "Crisis", on the other hand, the situation is different: the conceptual level of the problem (as the opposition between transcendental phenomenology and natural sciences) is explicit, while the ontological level is implicit. Nevertheless, it seems that Husserl has answers to both the "traditional" as well as the "conceptual" mind-body problems.*

**Keywords:** ontological (traditional) mind-body problem, conceptual mind-body problem, transcendental phenomenology, the lived-body (*der Leib*), Descartes, Husserl

The whole history of philosophy since the appearance of "epistemology" and the serious attempts at a transcendental philosophy is a history of tremendous tensions between objectivistic and transcendental philosophy. ...

The clarification of the origin of this internal split in the philosophical development, the analysis of the ultimate motives for this most radical transformation of the idea of philosophy, is of the utmost importance.

E. Husserl<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [Husserl, 1970: p. 70; Hua VI, S. 71].

## Introduction<sup>2</sup>

Phenomenology is a philosophical discipline that invites us to address the *things themselves* (die Sachen selbst), as they are *given* in our *experience* from the *first-person perspective*. Also, phenomenology is about dealing with the problems or matters themselves, in order to *clarify* and show their original *meaning*. Thus, phenomenology is dealing with problems *immediately*, rather than mediately — that is, as they are given in our *intuition*. Therefore, the main justificatory basis for all phenomenological investigations is phenomenological *evidence*.

In this paper, my key “die Sache selbst” will be the celebrated *mind-body problem*. In the phenomenological tradition, this problem is mostly ignored as the *metaphysical* one<sup>3</sup>. But, it is one of the foundational problems in the contemporary *philosophy of mind*. Here, I want to explicate the discussion of the mind-body problem in the context of Husserlian phenomenology (especially, his “Crisis”).

Conventionally, the origins of this problem date back to René Descartes and his “Meditations on the First Philosophy”. Here, I will argue that Descartes had not just one, but *two* mind-body problems. The first one is *explicit*: the mind-body (brain) problem. How can our immaterial mind or soul interact with the material body (brain)? This problem has been widely discussed for generations by philosophers and was thoroughly developed within the *philosophy of mind* tradition.

The second one is *implicit*: I argue that Descartes’ *res cogitans* can also be understood as a *concept* the *meaning* of which is *amathematical*, as opposed to *res extensa*, which is a purely *mathematical* concept (subject-matter to pure mathematics). Thus, Descartes’ implicit mind-body problem can be formulated as the *conceptual* mind-body problem.

And the very Cartesian framework can be considered from this two-fold perspective:

1. From the *ontological* perspective: as a gap between two *ontologically* different realms: material (body) and immaterial (mind);
2. And the *conceptual* one — as a gap between two different *meanings*: (proto) *phenomenological* meaning (mental; intellectual), which is asensible and asymbolic, and *natural-scientific* one (physical), which is sensible and symbolic (as the subject-matter of mathematics).

---

<sup>2</sup> In this paper, the attitude of my dealing with Descartes’ philosophy and Husserl’s phenomenology is *neutral*. Regarding Husserl, for example, it is not analytic (or West-Coast), nor continental (East-Coast). My attitude here is *problem oriented*: the main focus is made on the “mind-body problems” in Descartes and Husserl, and how Husserl’s phenomenology (namely, as depicted in “The crisis of the European sciences”) can be analyzed in this light. The same goes for Descartes: I am not interested in framing myself into this or that methodology while dealing with Descartes’ philosophy. I am involving this or that thinker only if he or she are *relevant* to the discussion taking place in this paper.

<sup>3</sup> Though, there are exceptions, e.g., [Smith, 1995; 2013; Gallagher, Zahavi, 2013: p. 123-125].

I will try to prove that Husserl has answers for both traditional and the conceptual mind-body problems.

Furthermore, one of the main ideas of the paper is to show that Husserl's "Crisis" represents not just one "crisis of the European sciences", but *two*:

1) *As a gap between the life-world and the natural sciences* (as explicated in Husserl's critique of Galileo);

2) *The opposition between the natural sciences (physicalism) and the transcendental phenomenology*. I think that, this crisis stems from the Cartesian metaphysics of *res cogitans* and *res extensa* (namely, from what I call the "conceptual" mind-body problem) and thus, is the "crisis" *within* the Cartesian framework, as well as *of* the latter.

I will put the major emphasis in this paper on the latter crisis and its origin and, will therefore omit the general discussion regarding the former (the life-world), though mention it only with regards to Husserl's understanding of the "traditional" mind-body problem.

In alliance with Husserl, I claim that Descartes' discovery of the *res cogitans* (as *mens*) opened the realm of *transcendental subjectivity*, and although Husserl's main target for the "crisis of the European sciences" is Galileo (relating the problem of the mathematization of nature), I want to demonstrate that the "modern opposition between physicalist objectivism and transcendental subjectivism" clearly has its origin in Descartes' "Meditations" and his main phenomenological discovery.

## **Part 1. Two mind-body problems in Descartes' "Meditations"**

Although, the *Second* and the *Sixth Meditations*<sup>4</sup> are considered to be the most important parts regarding the mind-body problem in Descartes' "Meditations", my references will be made to the whole corpus of these texts. I will follow this approach in order to demonstrate the difference between my understanding of the "traditional" mind-body problem and the "conceptual" mind-body problem.

### **1.1. The *traditional* mind-body problem**

The core of the *traditional* mind-body problem is the *ontological* distinction between *mind* (consciousness, soul) as something immaterial, non-physical and *body* (biological organism) as something material or physical. In contemporary philosophy of mind, the very heart<sup>5</sup> of the mind-body problem is the *hard problem of consciousness*, which can be stated in the following manner: "why does our brain produce consciousness, if everything in the physical theory is compatible with its absence?" In other words, "why aren't we just zombies, who in every respect are just like us, but lack the very things that make us human beings: phenomenal consciousness, or the 'what-it-is-likeness' of our experience"? Thus, the essence of it is an *explanation* of our consciousness and brain relation. Therefore, the essence of the traditional mind-body problem today is the "consciousness-brain" problem.

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, one can see it here: [Chalmers, 2002].

<sup>5</sup> [Crane, 2000]

Contemporary battles in the philosophy of mind can be summarized as those between physicalists and non-physicalists. The *hard problem of consciousness* is the central obstacle for the physicalist explanation of our mental life and phenomenology<sup>6</sup>.

No doubt, the origins of the traditional mind-body problem one can find in Descartes' "Meditations". The main issue of the traditional mind-body problem is that of *metaphysics* or *ontology*. What substance (or fundamental reality) is primary: *res cogitans* (the thinking thing) or *res extensa* (the extended thing)? Descartes' answer is well known: he is a *thinking thing*<sup>7</sup>, which he identifies with soul<sup>8</sup>. By the latter, Descartes understood what is indivisible and non-physical, and which is epistemically and ontologically prior to whatever is physical and extended and perceived by senses. By body (*corpus*) Descartes also understood what is "my own body"<sup>9</sup>, or as composition of organs and limbs. Thus, if my *primary* being is a *thinking thing*, my existence as a physical (and one can say *biological*) body is a *secondary* one.

But that being said, one doesn't have to understand Descartes as a solipsist. His all-bracketing doubt is nothing but a *thought experiment*; one of the purposes of which was the *clarification* of our ontology. In the *Sixth Meditation*, Descartes is talking about human nature as a "composite", which has both mind and body. One of Descartes' goals was therefore to show that our *primary ontology* is that of mind (soul, psyche or consciousness). It is *given* to us *directly*, rather than physical reality, which is given to us *indirectly* (through the mediation of senses).

---

<sup>6</sup> The originator of the *hard problem of consciousness* is the Australian philosopher David Chalmers. The classical statement of this problem and its treatment one can find here: [Chalmers, 1995; 1996].

<sup>7</sup> "I am, then, in the strict sense only a thing that thinks; that is, I am a mind, or intelligence, or intellect, or reason... (sum igitur praecise tantum res cogitans, id est, mens, sive animus, sive intellectus, sive ratio...)" [Descartes, 2008: p. 18; 1957: p. 27]. "What then am I? A thing that thinks. What is that? A thing that doubts, understands, affirms, denies, is willing, is unwilling, and also imagines and has sensory perceptions (Sed quid igitur sum? Res cogitans. Quid est hoc? Nempe dubitans, intelligens, affirmans, negans, volens, nolens, imaginas quoque, & sentiens)" [Descartes, 2008: p. 19; 1957: p. 28].

<sup>8</sup> "...[S]ense-perceptions and thinking (sentire & cogitare); and these actions I attributed to the soul (...quas quidem actiones ad animam referebam)" [Ibidem, p. 17; Descartes, 1957: p. 26].

<sup>9</sup> The following footnote in the Cottingham's translation expresses this ambiguity: "The Latin term *corpus* as used here by Descartes is ambiguous as between 'body' (i.e. corporeal matter in general) and 'the body' (i.e. this particular body of mine). The French version preserves the ambiguity" [Descartes, 2008: p. 54].

"Well, the first thought to come to my mind was that I had a face, hands, arms and the whole mechanical structure of limbs which can be seen in a corpse, and which I called body (Nempe occuberat primo, me habere vultum, manus, brachia, totamque hanc membrorum machinam, quails etiam in canvere cernitur, & quam corporis nomine dignabam)" [Ibidem, p. 17; Descartes, 1957: p. 26]. "I am not that structure of limbs which I call a human body (...non sum compages illa membrorum, quae corpus humanum appellatur...)" [Descartes, 2008: p. 18; 1957: p. 27].

## 1.2. The conceptual mind-body problem

The *conceptual* mind-body problem is the problem of "mind" and "body" as *concepts*, which have different *meanings*. Thus, it is the problem of *meanings*, rather than of ontologies.

In this light, *res extensa* is a concept of a physical thing and its meaning is the subject-matter of pure mathematics<sup>10</sup> and thus can be formalized (quantified) and is *symbolic* concept in its essence.

*Res cogitans* is the concept of a non-physical thing, which *cannot* be quantified (formalized or mathematized). Thus, it is *asymbolic* concept<sup>11</sup>.

As we have seen, *ontologically* *res cogitans* is prior to *res extensa*. The same goes for them as *semantical* concepts — *res cogitans* possesses meaning, which is *primary* in relation to that of *res extensa*. That is, *subjective* meaning, which is grounded in intuition and is *asymbolic*, is *primary* in relation to the *physical* meaning, which is the subject-matter of pure mathematics.

In this sense, *subjective* meaning is more "objective" and *primary for us* than that of *physics*, which is relative in its essence, and is the subject-matter of the mathematical sciences<sup>12</sup>. Further, corporeal nature, which is quantifiable, is *given* to us through *asymbolic* (immediate) intuition. Namely the latter fulfills the former, which is given symbolically (mediately). Mathematics and physics are not invented by our intuition, but nevertheless, are discovered and given through it. *Subjective* meaning (as *self-evident*, guaranteed by God's existence and indubitable) is *primary*. *Physico-mathematical* meaning is secondary. In other words, *res extensa* is

---

<sup>10</sup> For example, in the end of the *Fifth Meditation*, Descartes is talking about "the whole of that corporeal nature which is the subject-matter of pure mathematics (...tum etiam de omni illa natura corporea, quae est purae Metheseos objectum...)" [Descartes, 2008: p. 49; 1957: p. 71].

<sup>11</sup> By *symbolic*, I mean that, which can be expressed through the means of *mathematics or mathematical (formal/symbolic)* logic. By *asymbolic*, I mean that, which *cannot* be expressed symbolically in the given sense.

<sup>12</sup> As Descartes puts it in the *First Meditation*: "...physics, astronomy, medicine, and all other disciplines which depend on the study of composite things, are doubtful; while arithmetic, geometry and other subjects of this kind, which deal with only with the simplest kind, which deal only with the simplest and most general things, regardless of whether they really exist in nature or not, contain something certain and indubitable. For whether I am awake or asleep, two and three added together are five, and a square has no more than four sides. It seems impossible that such transparent truths should incur any suspicion of being false. (...Physicam, Astronomiam, Medicinam, disciplinasque alias omnes, qua a rerum compositarum consideratione dependent, dubias quidem esse; atque Arithmeticae, Geometricae, aliasque ejusmodi, quae non nisi de simplicissimis & maxime generalibus rebus tractant, atque utrum eae sint in rerum natura necne, parum currant, aliquid certi atque indubitati continere. Nam sive vigilem, sive dormiam, duo & tria simul juncta sunt quinque, quadratumque non plura habet latera quam quatuor; nec sieri posse videtur ut tam perspicuae veritates in suspicionem falsitatis incurrant)" [Descartes, 2008: p. 14; 1957: p. 20].

In this sense, there is some contradiction regarding the essence of the physical objects (which is relative and thus, dubitable), and that of pure mathematics, which is in its essence indubitable. The question can be put in the following way: "How can something dubitable in its essence (physical objects) be the subject-matter of that, which is indubitable in its nature (i.e., pure mathematics)?"

given through *res cogitans*. But again, towards the end of the “Meditations”, Descartes considers the mind-body relation in its *unity*, which can be reinterpreted as the *unity of asymbolic res cogitans and the symbolic res extensa*.

Let’s sum up what was just said. *Res extensa* appears to be the concept of the physical thing, which in its essence is quantifiable, and as such is a subject-matter of pure mathematics. *Res cogitans* is the concept of the non-physical thing, which is given to us in intuition and is self-evident, and is essentially not quantifiable. Thus, the meaning of the *res cogitans* cannot be expressed symbolically. Its nature is *asymbolic*. On the other hand, *res extensa* can be fully expressed through mathematical symbols; therefore, its nature is *symbolic*. Hence, *res cogitans*’s meaning is *primary* for us and is grasped in intuition *immediately*. The meaning of *res extensa* is given to us in *intuition* as well, but mediately (through symbols). In other words, *res cogitans* is a *phenomenological* concept which opens door to the dimension of *phenomenological meaning*. *Res extensa* is a *physical* concept, which in its essence is mathematizable, and expresses the *meaning of the natural sciences*. Thus, one can already see the essence of the conceptual mind-body problem here at hand: as the *gap* between *phenomenological meaning* and *that of natural sciences*. In my opinion, this is the very beginning and origin of one of the crises of the European sciences (namely, as the *opposition between transcendental phenomenology and the natural sciences*), as portrayed in Husserl’s last work.

As mentioned-above, the *Second* and the *Sixth Meditations* are considered to be the most important Cartesian Meditations necessary for grasping the essence of the mind-body problem and Descartes metaphysics. Here, in this section, I want to attempt to look at those two *Meditations* in a different light.

### ***Some Case Studies***

#### ***Second Meditation***

In this *Meditation*, Descartes distinguishes between wax as given through the *senses*, and as given through *mind* (*mens*). It appears that the true nature of the wax is *not* as something which has taste, smell, color, size, shape and is able to produce sound, but as something “extended, flexible and changeable” (*extensum quid, flexibile, mutabile*)<sup>13</sup> [Descartes, 2008: p. 20; 1957: p. 31]. And the very *essence* of wax as something changeable and flexible is grasped not by our faculty of imagination, which still depends on our senses, but “by the *mind* alone” (*sed sola mente percipere*) [Descartes, 2008: p. 21; 1957: p. 31]. Thus, the real perception of wax is nothing “but of purely mental scrutiny” (*sed solis mentis inspectio*) [Ibidem].

Thus, wax as a physical thing has two kinds of givenness:

---

<sup>13</sup> “So what was it in the wax that I understood with such distinctness? Evidently none of the features which I arrived at by means of the senses; for whatever came under taste, smell, sight, touch or hearing has now altered — yet the wax remains.” (*Quid erat igitur in ea quod tam distincte comprehendebatur? Certe nihil eorum quae sensibus attingebam; nam quaecunque sub gustum, vel odoratum, vel visum, vel tactum vel auditum veniebant, mutatae jam sunt: remanet cera*) [Descartes, 2008: p. 20; 1957: p. 30].

1) *Sensory and imaginary* givenness: color, taste, smell, touch, sound, shape, size. This kind of givenness is not essential one. It is dubitable (as everything, which is given through senses) and thus, *contingent*.

2) *Mental or intellectual* givenness: wax as "extended, flexible and changeable" is essential, indubitable<sup>14</sup> and necessary<sup>15</sup>. Namely this kind of givenness represents physical thing as *res extensa* and is given through *mind* (or *res cogitans*) only. Therefore, *res extensa* (the *essence* of the physical thing) is given through *res cogitans*.

### Sixth Meditation

Here, Descartes still distinguishes between mind as pure understanding (*puram intellectionem*) and imagination (*imaginationem*) as based on sensory perception, which represent corporeal nature as a subject-matter of pure mathematics [Descartes, 2008: p.50-51; 1957: p. 72-74]. Although, here Descartes stresses the *unity*<sup>16</sup> or *combination* of mind and body<sup>17</sup> rather than their division; mind with its faculty of pure understanding still has the epistemological priority: for example, stars as given through senses do not represent their actual size, and only mind is capable of their true representation<sup>18</sup>. In the composite of the mind and body (*composito ex mente & corpore*), sensory (or bodily) perception has the function of providing the information to the mind about "what is beneficial or harmful for the composite of which the mind is a part..." (...quia nempe sensuous perceptionibus, quae proprie tantum a natura datae sunt ad menti significandum quatenam composito, cujus pars est, commode sint vel incomoda...) [Descartes, 2008: p. 57; 1957: p. 82-83].

Our body or corporeal nature in general as extended is a subject-matter of pure mathematics because they are *divisible* (*divisibile*). By contrast, mind cannot be expressed mathematically, because it is *indivisible* (*indivisibilis*): willing, understanding, sensory perceptions are not parts of the mind, but "it is one and the same mind

---

<sup>14</sup> That is, one cannot doubt that the essence of the physical thing is extension. Though, it does not mean that one cannot doubt the very *existence* of the extended things.

<sup>15</sup> In this *Meditation*, before the wax example, Descartes states: "At present I am not admitting anything except what is necessarily true" (*nihil nunc admitto nisi quod necessario sit verum*) [Descartes, 2008: p. 18; 1957: p. 27].

<sup>16</sup> "...I am not merely present in my body as a sailor is present in a ship, but I am very closely joined and, as it were intermingled with it, so that I and body form a unit." (...me non tantum adesse meo corpori ut natura adest navigio, sed illi arctissime esse conjunctum & quasi permixtum, adeo ut unum quid illo componam) [Descartes, 2008: p. 56; 1957: p. 81].

<sup>17</sup> "...I am a combination of body and mind..." (...corpore & mente sum compositus...) [Descartes, 2008: p. 56; 1957: p. 80].

<sup>18</sup> "For knowledge of the truth about such things seems to belong to the mind alone, not to the combination mind and body. Hence, although a star has no greater effect on my eye than the flame of a small light, there is no inclination in me to believe that the star is no bigger than the light; I have simply made this judgement from childhood onwards without any rational basis." (...quia de iis verum scire as mentem solam, non autem ad compositum, videtur pertinere. Ita quamvis stella non magis oculum meum quam ignis exiquae facis afficiat, nulla tamen in eo realis sive positive propensio est ad credendum illam non esse majorum, sed hoc sine ratione ab inuente aetate judicavi...) [Descartes, 2008: p. 57; 1957: p. 83].

that wills, and understands and has sensory perceptions” (...quia una & eadem mens est quae vult, quae sentit, quae intelligit) [Descartes, 2008: p. 59; 1957: p. 86].

The solution to the *ontological* mind-body problem has a *neuroscientific* inclination: only the *brain* (tantummodo a cerebro) is the connection between mind and body, and that, which affects mind immediately (or maybe, some part of the brain, by which Descartes understood the pineal gland (conarion)) [Descartes, 2008: p. 59-60; 1957: p. 86].

If to speak about the *conceptual* mind-body problem, in the context of mind-body *unity* or “the nature of man as a combination of mind and body” (naturam hominis ut ex mente & corpore compositi)<sup>19</sup>, I think we can suggest that the phenomenological meaning as expressed by *res cogitans* is *prior* to the physical-mathematical meaning, as expressed by *res extensa*. That is, though phenomenology and natural sciences are essentially different, nevertheless, they form the *composite*, in which phenomenology is epistemically prior to the natural sciences and is more significant *for us*, but that does not mean that they must be apart from each other.

### *A Note on Descartes' Notion of "Intellect"*

It has to be noticed that Descartes uses “intellect” in a twofold way. The first one is “intellect” as the *synonym* of “mind” (mens) and “thinking thing” (res cogitans) in general. Already in the *Second Meditation*, one can meet the following statement: “At present I am not admitting anything except what is necessarily true. I am, then, in the strict sense only a thing that thinks; that is, I am mind (mens), or intelligence (animus), or intellect (intellectus), or reason (ratio)...” [Descartes, 2008: p. 18; 1957: p. 27]. It's clear that Descartes finds it *necessarily true*.

In the beginning of the *Sixth Meditation*, Descartes is distinguishing between pure understanding (puram intellectionem) (or power of understanding (a vi intelligendi)) and imagination (imaginationem) (or power of imagining (vim imaginandi)) and sensory perception (sensu perceptae) [Descartes, 2008: p. 50-51; 1957: p. 72-73]. As it was noted, the former is essential to our mind, the latter is not<sup>20</sup>. Later on, Descartes follows the same argument:

“[...] I find in myself faculties for certain special modes of thinking (modis cogitandi), namely imagination and sensory perception (imaginandi & sentiendi). Now I can clearly and distinctly understand myself as a whole without these faculties; but I cannot, conversely, understand these faculties without me, that is, without an *intellectual substance*<sup>21</sup> (substantia intelligente) to inhere it. This is because there is an intellectual act (intellectionem) included in their essential definition; and hence I perceive that the distinction between them and myself corresponds to

---

<sup>19</sup> [Descartes, 2008: p. 61; 1957: p. 88].

<sup>20</sup> “...I consider that this power of imagining which is in me, differing as it does from the power of understanding, is not necessary constituent of my own essence, that is, of the essence of my mind” (...considero istam vim imaginandi quae in me est, prout differ a vi intelligendi, ad mei ipsius, hoc est ad mentis meae essentiam non require...) [Descartes, 2008: p. 51; 1957: p. 73].

<sup>21</sup> *Italics* are mine. — A.L.



the distinction between the modes of a thing and the thing itself" [Descartes, 2008: p. 54; 1957: p. 78].

In this sense, intellect, as a *thinking thing*, contains *subjective experience or qualitative feel*. To illustrate this, let me cite the very important passage from the *Second Meditation*: "...even if, as I have supposed, none of the objects of imagination are real, the power of imagination is something which really exists and is part of my thinking. Lastly, it is also the same I who has sensory perceptions, or is aware of bodily things as it were through the senses. For example, I am now seeing light, hearing a noise, feeling heat. But I am asleep and, so all this is false. Yet, I certainly *seem* to see, to hear, and to be warmed. This cannot be false; what is called "having a sensory perception" is strictly just this, and in this is restricted sense of the term it is simply thinking" [Descartes, 2008: p. 19; 1957: p. 29].

In the *Third Meditation*, Descartes distinguishes between thoughts as "images" (or "ideas") and other thoughts with the additional variation of forms including *volitions* and *emotions*<sup>22</sup>.

But further, in the *Sixth Meditation*, it seems there is an implication that intellect has *nothing* to do with *subjective experience* and *qualia*:

"Nature also teaches me, by these sensations of pain, hunger, thirst and so on, that I am not merely present in my body as a sailor is present in a ship, but that I am very closely joined and, as it were, intermingled with it, so that I and the body form a unit. If this were not so, I, who am nothing but a thinking thing (*res cogitans*), would not feel pain when the body was hurt, but would perceive the damage *purely by the intellect*<sup>23</sup> (*puro intellectu*) just as a sailor perceives by sight if anything in his ship is broken, Similarly, when the body needed food or drink, I should have an explicit understanding (*expresse intelligerem*) of the fact, instead of having confused sensations of hunger and thirst. For these sensations of hunger, thirst, pain and so on are nothing but confused modes of thinking which arise *from the union*<sup>24</sup> and, as it were, intermingling of the mind with the body" [Descartes, 2008: p. 56; 1957: p. 81].

As one can see, here, in the *Sixth Meditation*' passage, intellect is *not* identical with *res cogitans*, as opposed to the *Second Meditation*, where *intellect*, even if the objects of sensory perception do not exist, still *seems* to have the very *perceptions* of them, *as if* these objects really existed. And the very perceptions (seeing or hearing something, feeling pain, hunger or thirst, being warmed etc.) *cannot* be false, even if the real objects which caused them were inexistent, because intellect (*ego*) have them as *intentional objects*, which are accompanied with *qualitative feel*.

---

<sup>22</sup> "...thus when I will (*volo*), or am afraid (*timeo*), or affirm (*affirmo*), or deny (*nego*), there is always a particular thing which I take as the object of thought (*subjectum meae cogitationis apprehendo*), but my thought (*cogitationes*) includes something more than the likeness of the thing. Some thoughts in this category are called volitions (*voluntates*) or emotions (*affectus*), while others are called judgements (*judicia*)" [Descartes, 2008: p. 26; 1957: p. 37]

<sup>23</sup> *Italics* are mine. — A.L.

<sup>24</sup> *Italics* are mine. — A.L.

Thus, in the *Sixth Meditation* passage, cited-above, intellect has a role of an *information-processing tool* with nothing subjective as its companion. And the very qualitative sensations are caused by the *union* of mind (*mens*) with the body (*corpus*), and thus, do not belong essentially to the intellect. Therefore, those, who are inclined to label Descartes as “pure intellectualist” only in this *latter* sense, have to mind the very ambiguity of the Cartesian notion of intellect in general.

(To be continued)

#### REFERENCES

- Chalmers, D.J. (1995). Facing up to the Problem of Consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2 (3), 200-219.
- Chalmers, D.J. (1996). *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, D.J. (Ed.) (2002). *Philosophy of mind: classical and contemporary readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crane, T. (2000). The Origins of Qualia. In: T. Crane, S. Patterson (Eds.), *History of Mind-Body Problem*. London: Routledge.
- Descartes, R. (1957). *Meditationes de Prima Philosophia*. In: *Oeuvres de Descartes* (vol. 7). Paris: Vrin.
- Descartes, R. (2008). *Meditations on First Philosophy*. In: *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*. Tr. by J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff, D. Murgoch, A. Kenny (vol. II). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gallagher, S., Zahavi, D. (2013). *The Phenomenological Mind*. S.I.: Routledge.
- Husserl, E. (1960). *Cartesian Meditations. An Introduction to Phenomenology*. Tr. by D. Cairns. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Husserl, E. (1970). *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Tr. by D. Carr. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Husserl, E. (1976). Die Krisis der Europäischen Wissenschaften und die Transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die Phänomenologische Philosophie. Hrsg. von W. Biemel. In: E. Husserl, *Gesammelte Werke* (Bd. VI). S.I.: HAAG Martinus Nijhoff.
- Husserl, E. (1991). Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge. In: E. Husserl, *Gesammelte Werke* (Bd. I). S.I.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Husserl, E. (1995). Ideen zu reinen Phänomenologie und Phänomenologischen Philosophie. In: E. Husserl, *Gesammelte Werke* (Bd. III/1, Buch 1). S.I.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Husserl, E. (2012). *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*. Tr. by W.R. Boyce Gibson. London, New York: Routledge.
- Smith, D.W. (1995). Mind and Body. In: *The Cambridge Companion to Husserl*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, D.W. (2013). *Husserl*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. S.I.: Routledge.

Received 08.06.20