
Representation and Recollection

THE ROLE OF REPRESENTATION

A division of the abilities of the mind into perceptive and thinking capacities is old and common; one of Hegel's more noticeable innovations is a tripartite division of the mental faculties into the intuitive, the representative, and the thinking. The middle element here, representation (*Vorstellung*),¹ presents us with particular difficulties. Some of the phenomena Hegel treats under the rubric of "representation" are clearly sensory—such things as delusions, dreams, and hallucinations—yet others are such as we would today unanimously attribute to thought, namely, the phenomenon of language. I begin here by distinguishing representation from intuition. In the second section we turn to recollection, the lowest level

1. *Vorstellung* also presents related difficulties for the translator. For Kant it is the generic term covering mental acts and is usually translated as "representation." In Hegel's usage *Vorstellung* is no longer the genus of all mental acts, for it does not include thought. Petry translates it as "presentation," whereas Wallace and Miller continue to use "representation." I have adopted "representation" partly to prevent confusion with the more general notion of something's being presented to spirit and to mobilize the play on "re-presentation," which captures some of the spirit, although not the exact semantic content, of Hegel's plays on *Vor-stellung*, and partly because Hegel's criticisms of *Vorstellung* are criticisms of what is today called the representational theory of mind. "Representation" is a fortuitous choice as well in that representations are treated by Hegel as re-presentations, or presentations in a new mode, of intuitions.

of representation. We return to the distinction between representation and thought in Chapter 11.

When Hegel separates representation from the phenomena of intuition, he claims that in representation the fact that the mental state or act is subjective becomes explicit:

However, that the object has the character of being mine is only implicitly present in intuition and is first posited in representation. In intuition the objectivity [*Gegenständlichkeit*] of the content predominates. Only when I reflect that it is I who has the intuition—only then do I step into the standpoint of representation. (§449, *Zusatz*, my tr.)

Accordingly, spirit posits intuition as its own, penetrates it, makes it into something inward—recollects itself in it, becomes present to itself in it and thereby free. Through this inwardization intelligence raises itself to the stage of representation. Representing spirit has intuition, which is sublated in it and neither has vanished nor is something only past. (§450, *Zusatz*, my tr.)

It might appear that any representation wears its subjectivity on its sleeve, yet such things as hallucinations do not obviously present themselves as any more subjective than any other perceptual states, although Hegel calls them representations. Of course all our mental states, perceptual states as well, are subjective, but what qualifies these mental states to be particularly well suited to be called representations?

At the level of representation, the subjectivity of the content of the mental state, which was only implicit in intuition, is made explicit. Hegel does not think, however, that it must be explicit to the subject having the representation that it is subjective—otherwise hallucinations and delusions could not be considered representations. It must rather be made explicit to an objective point of view. But an objective point of view also realizes that even in intuition the content is subjective, although it agrees with the objective reality. To this extent, intuitions and representations are not exclusive, for intuitions form a special subset of representations.

We still need to distinguish the sense in which the subjectivity of the content of a mental event becomes explicit in a representation. We can understand this by asking what would count as the correct

explanation of the presence to mind of that content. If we reflect for a moment on what we have already seen of Hegel's theory, it is apparent that what the manifold of sensation is presented *as* is not an occurrent, simple property of a certain complex of sensations; rather, what a complex of sensations is presented as is a matter both of the internal structure the activity of spirit has endowed that complex of sensations with and of the relations that that complex, again through the activity of spirit, has with other sensate complexes. Thus a mental state that seems to fit in with the course of intuition in us—and is therefore presented as an intuition—may, on later reflection, be discovered to have been a mental state that does not cohere with the order of intuition and is thus a mere representation. In theoretical spirit we adopt an objective standpoint even on that which is subjective. Thus representations are not self-presenting in the sense that, when had, they reveal of necessity all their essential qualities, including whether they are mere representations or representations that also qualify as intuitions in virtue of correct connection with extra-mental objects.

This last remark should also make it clear that there is no absolute demarcation in internal ("felt") qualities between intuitions and mere representations, at least not at the lowest levels of representation, for indeed, in intuition itself we have a representation. One is tempted to say that the difference between intuition and representation is the attitude the mind takes toward its own state, but this way of talking nourishes the misleading picture of a spectator in a theater watching images on a screen and reacting to them. We must rather tell a more complex story and give up the attempt to simplify so radically. The mental life of an individual forms a whole, and even this whole is not a totally isolated atom but interacts in various ways with the subject's environment. Each mental act or state is an item in the course of the world that is open to explanation, and the distinction between some of them as intuitions and some of them as mere representations lies more in the kind of explanatory considerations that must be advanced to explain them than in any properties intrinsic to the states themselves. Thus mental states are classed as mere representations both when they fall short of intuition and when they are at a higher level. Let me explain this.

The first constraint we must recognize is that accounting for a mental state or act is not just a matter of explaining its origin in strict

causal terms; one must also show how the act fits in with the subject's other mental states and the state of the environment. Thus it is important to give, not only a causal chain leading from the object to sensations forming the material of the mental state, but also an account of the principles according to which these sensations are unified with all others to form a coherent whole. This is a large part of what we are saying when we describe a mental state in terms of its content. The full explanation of the genesis of a mental state includes as a crucial factor its fit with other mental states—even though this is a matter of interpretation.² We must remember that the coherence of any sensation with any other need not be evident to the subject itself; nonetheless, that there is such a coherence is presupposed by our assigning the sensation to the same subject.

There are three important factors to be taken into account in the explanation of a sensuous mental state: the environment, the perceptual apparatus, and the internal spiritual apparatus responsible for the constructive activity. In normal intuition, the activity of the subjective spirit and the operation of the sensory apparatus are standard and therefore not important in explaining that particular state. When a subject is alert, in standard conditions, with perceptual organs operating properly, no reference to the state of the subject other than its orientation in the environment and perhaps perceptual set is necessary to explain why the subject has the experience it has. The subject's own state and activities, since quite normal, form part of the background conditions of the perceptual experience, and the burden of explaining why that particular experience is had is carried by facts about the physical environment of the subject.

In cases of mere representation, the explanatory burden is shifted for whatever reason to facts about the subject itself, whether about the perceptual apparatus or the spiritual apparatus. The subject's own activities are now important in explaining why this experience was had at that time. There is still a causal story to be told about the generation of the sensate material, but now the form that that material is given by spirit is not a normal *reconstruction* of the cause

2. These considerations of coherence and the process of interpretation are holistic, teleological, and normative, of course; see Chapter 1.

of the sensations. The standard relations between the causal and semantic characteristics of the mental states do not hold. It is this difference that means that the experience is not an intuition, but this difference need not be evident in the experience itself. Such a situation can occur in two ways: (a) there can be some disturbance in the normal operation of the sensory organs; (b) it is possible that there is some breakdown in the activity of construction. This second alternative can occur for two different reasons: (i) the causal input, the material of sensation, does not fully determine the object constructed, and due to lack of or faulty contextual information the wrong object is constructed or the object is constructed with some wrong properties; (ii) the mind itself "processes" the material incorrectly and constructs something that corresponds to nothing in the environment. These possibilities allow for illusion, hallucination, and even madness, and in such cases it is clear that the state of the subject is crucial in the explanation of the experience. In cases of such a breakdown in the otherwise normal course of intuition we are forced to be more aware of the subject's own role in intuition, and of the fact that the subject possesses a *subjective representation* of the extra-mental world. In this way some representations are best understood as falling short of intuition.

There are, however, other ways the contribution of spirit to its own experience can come to the fore. Spirit is free—it determines itself and is not totally dependent on the external world for its content. Insofar as spirit determines its own experience, it is evident that spirit itself bears the explanatory burden in explaining why it has this experience now.³ The most intuitive example of such self-determination by spirit is a case of imagination, where, for instance, I let my fancy wander amid images of flowered fields and

3. It would be a mistake to think that spirit's self-determination is to be understood here as spirit's *willing* a certain state into existence, for a volition itself is something to which spirit determines itself. At this level, spirit's freedom is the freedom of organic self-determination, of the independence of the complex from the environment. The force of saying that spirit determines itself in a certain way is not the imputation of a volition or some such mental state but rather a sign that we are at an explanatory dead end. Since spirit is free, its actions are not externally caused, and saying that spirit has freely determined itself in a certain manner lets us know that the explanation stops with spirit itself. The explanation of a free act of spirit is in terms of spirit's ends, which it has determined for itself and which are ultimately implicit in its essence.

beautiful skies, thus escaping the drear of a winter's day. This need not be an intentional action, something I set out to do, but it is something I do. Alternatively, I could sit down and work on designing a house or solving a problem. We can give reasons for why I am thinking what I am thinking, but these are again internal to me and refer to my thoughts, desires, goals, character, perhaps my physical condition.

This notion of a spirit freely determining its own mental content seems to raise some problems. Do we, by this formulation, commit Hegel to the thesis that a spirit can create sensations, the basic material of mind, freely? Since sensations are, as we have already seen, states of sensory organs having immediate being for mind, this interpretation would involve mind's ability to influence the body directly. Hegel would object to putting the question this way, for it suggests a real separation of mind and body, but the point does confront him with a real difficulty. If there are sensations that do not arise by the standard causal patterns, Hegel must account for such processes—but to my knowledge he does not do so.

Need we suppose that the mind can simply create sensations ex nihilo for use in imagination? Hegel might say that there is a continual though changing fund of sensation, that in creating representations spirit constructs the sensations in novel ways, making use of the material at hand. In talking about a certain case of visions that someone had and recognized to be mere visions, Hegel remarks, "Internally we have before us a representation, and this presence is a moment of corporeity, and through illness this presence can be so augmented that it assumes the form of seeing" (quoted from the Kehler ms. in *PSS*, vol. 2, p. 271, my tr.). But to suppose that the eidetic image of a flower arrangement which an eidetic imager may have while, say, skiing in the mountains is merely a novel reconstruction of the sensations caused in standard ways by the environment seems to stretch plausibility. An eidetic image is too close to the original. Hegel's rather bland explanation that something was brought about by spirit or dredged up from within spirit's "night-like abyss" (§453) is simply insufficient.

If this is the nature of the self-determination of spirit in imagination, how exactly does it differ from an illusion or hallucination, spirit's merely *incorrect* construction of the material of sensation? Again, internally there need be no difference, except insofar as in

spirit's free self-determination the constructs are presented to mind as bearing the stamp of self-creation. This difference, however, can only be cashed in in terms of the relations the construct bears to other mental states or acts. For instance, suppose someone to be having a pink elephant experience, although there are no such elephants around. Whether we say that the person is hallucinating or merely imagining vividly depends to a great extent on the further behavior and reports of the person. If she describes the elephants in detail, matches their color to a printer's sample, and yet does not expect others to see or respond to the elephants, does not cower in front of them, and so on, we may well marvel at her imaginative capabilities but we shall not assert that she is hallucinating or under an illusion. To be hallucinating she must think that there are elephants out there, and we tell this by, for example, her running to escape being trampled. Whether a representation is an imagining or an incorrect intuition depends on the connection it is given to other representations.⁴

RECOLLECTION

Hegel's treatment of Representation is divided triadically, under the headings Recollection (*Erinnerung*), Imagination (*Einbildungskraft*), and Memory (*Gedächtnis*). These headings are a bit misleading; there are perhaps no better words for labeling what he is talking about, but if one takes these in their ordinary meaning certain confusions are bound to arise. In each case Hegel isolates particular mental abilities, and although each retains some relation to the normal sense of the word, it is stripped bare of most of the connotations it normally carries. Furthermore, the finer points go absolutely untouched, as is necessary in an encyclopedic treatment. Hegel warns us also against treating each of these three as different and separate faculties constituting the mind. The three are understood by Hegel to be hierarchically ordered in increasing complexity, each one presupposing and involving its predecessor: "The precise nature of a truly philosophical comprehension consists however in the

4. Some of the material dealing with derangement quoted in Chapter 5 reinforces this interpretation.

grasping of the rational connection present between these forms, in recognizing the sequence of the organic development of intelligence within them" (§451, *Zusatz*).

Recollection, the first of the three main stages of representation, is itself divided triadically. This creates some technical difficulties for us, for Hegel uses the important term "recollection" within each of these three stages without acknowledging explicitly that the meaning has shifted slightly because the term is now applied to a simpler, now to a more complex, ability. To avoid merely verbal confusions at the small expense of some stylistic awkwardness, I simply subscript the terms to make it clear in each case which level I am dealing with.

Recollection₁ is described as follows: "As initially recollecting intuition, intelligence posits the content of feeling in its inwardness, in its own space and its own time. It is thus (1) *image* freed from its initial immediacy and abstract singularity against others and taken up into the universality of the I in general. The image no longer has the complete determinateness that intuition has and is arbitrary or contingent; it is in general isolated from the external place, time, and immediate context in which intuition stood" (§452, my tr.). In recollection₁ the sensate material present to mind (the content of intuition) is no longer presented as an object external to the mind in space and time. The sensate material is still given an internal structure sufficient to make it a representation of an object, but the particular sensate clump is no longer united with all the others by those strict categorial principles that impose spatiotemporal structure on the field of intuition. Thus the image is no longer presented as in objective space and time, but as an object in no particular space at no particular time. The object imaged has thus been removed or abstracted from its spatiotemporal context. If I consider the objects in my visual field not as physical objects independent of me but as visual images, even though I may be correctly intuiting a typewriter and desk, I have moved up to the recollection₁ of these objects, for the objects are no longer located for me in objective space.

This abstraction of the image (whether visual, aural, gustatory, etc.) from its immediate spatiotemporal context is the first important step presupposed by all higher activities of spirit, for all these, especially thought itself, involve the ability to go beyond the immediate situation into the actual past in memory, into nonactual possibilities in the imaginative construction of possible pasts, presents,

and futures, and beyond the sensible altogether in the contemplation of the universal per se. The first and elementary step toward these more sophisticated intellectual achievements is this simple abstraction of the present material from its complete context.

Although the content of feeling is no longer completely subjected to those rules or categories that impose complete spatiotemporal determinateness on it, it is certainly not left devoid of such structure, and the entire categorial arsenal developed in the *Encyclopedia Phenomenology* is presupposed here. Without these categories, the subject-object split would remain meaningless to the subject, who would be unable to perform the act of recollection, unable to contrast his states with extra-mental objects at all. In recollection₁, "what is represented, however, gains this permanence only at the cost of the clarity and freshness of the immediate, fully determinate singularity of what is intuited. Intuition palls and dims in becoming an image" (§452, *Zusatz*, my tr.). This passage brings to mind Hume's distinction between an impression and an idea. Hume distinguishes the two solely on the basis of their force and vivacity, which seems to be similar to Hegel's distinction between the relative freshness and clarity of intuition and recollection₁. But Hume's differentiation between impression and idea is merely phenomenological; he has no other way to explain why an idea is less vivid than an impression other than that ideas derive from impressions, for which conclusion a major argument is that the impressions are more vivid. But since Hume draws several other distinctions on the basis of force and vivacity, it is not clear just what the distinction between impression and idea, which is supposed to be an important distinction in kind, really amounts to.

Hegel, on the other hand, can give a theoretical explanation of the phenomenological difference between intuition and representation. Vivid and strong presence to mind is not merely a matter of the original strength of sensation, according to Hegel, but also of the weight in the constructive process it is given.⁵ But if we are to

5. We must remember that the categorial scheme developed in the *Encyclopedia Phenomenology* does not give us rules for the construction of particular objects in general. The construction of particular objects always demands special knowledge; it is, moreover, imbued with thought and is something that we unconsciously and sometimes consciously learn to do. To a trained taster certain flavors, in a complex dish or drink may be quite strong and vivid, while to the untrained palate they are lost in the multitude of other flavors.

construct an object abstracted from its spatiotemporal, causal environment, certain of its properties and certain of the sensations it causes to arise within us must be given short shrift in the construction. To give them their full due would involve constructing their impact on the environment, and this would slowly extend itself throughout the spatiotemporal world. To the extent that these properties of the object (ultimately all of them to varying degrees) are not given their full weight in the construction, the object is presented as less clear, less vivid, less fresh. One might consider as an analogy the phenomenological difference between the sound a familiar voice makes in the various environments in which we normally hear it and the radical change it undergoes in an anechoic chamber, where it is deprived of its normal richness through interaction with the environment.

Recollection₁ is a fairly straightforward concept. Recollection₂ is a little more problematic, for it is the unconscious preservation of the image isolated in recollection₁. Each representation we have is preserved in the "night-like abyss" of intelligence. We encountered a claim like this about the feeling soul earlier, but I said little about it then, so let me say a bit more now. First of all, there is no clear rule for individuating representations or feelings. Is the representation of a typewriter a different representation from the representation of a blue typewriter or the representation of a battered, old typewriter with thirteen keys and the ribbon missing? All our intuitions can be treated as representations, so we must take Hegel to mean that our complete intuitive experience of the world, as well as any inner intuitions we are able to develop at higher stages, is preserved in recollection₂. In a stretch of intuitive experience we are able to focus on any of its aspects and turn it into an image, and as potential images the whole panoply is preserved within recollection₂.

Second, the mode of preservation in recollection₂ is not correctly conceived as an anatomization and pigeonholing operation within the mind: "It is the inability to grasp the universal, which is concrete in itself while yet remaining simple, that occasioned [the notion that] particular representations are preserved in particular fibers and locations; different things are supposed also to need singularized spatial existence" (§453, my tr.). Hegel insists on the "need to grasp the Concept in its concreteness, to grasp it, as it were, as the seed which contains *affirmatively* and as a *virtual* possibility, all the

determinatenesses which first come into existence in the development of the tree" (§453). It is clear that thinking of the images as preserved in pigeonholes or as stored in Locke's mental closet promotes a thorough misconception of mind, for then the images would remain independent actualities that are merely rearranged by the mind. But the images no longer *exist*, they are not discrete individuals discoverable within the mind but potentialities capable of being actualized by the mind. Locke's image of a progressively better stocked closet is exactly wrong.

Hegel heavily emphasizes the unity and simplicity of spirit exhibited by the fact that all these images are retained, but not individually and discretely. But an even more important lesson perhaps is the generative power of spirit. Hegel uses the metaphor of a seed: "the germ which contains affirmatively and as a virtual possibility, all the determinatenesses which first come into existence in the development of the tree" (§453). The infinite generative power of our minds has been a central fact in contemporary reflections on the nature of mind—but contemporary theorists have been generally concerned to show how such infinitary capabilities can rest on finite resources. Any attempt to sketch how the infinitary can be generated by the finite is noticeably absent from Hegel's works, however, for he is convinced that the finite really presupposes the infinite. The finite, he believes, might be reached by an "analysis" of the infinite (as a point, perhaps, is an analytic part of a line), but the (true) infinite cannot be generated by synthesizing finite pieces (as a line cannot be built by stringing points together).

Hegel's talk of an "abyss" also constitutes a denial that there is any privileged set of simple ideas or images into which perceptions can be decomposed and from which memory or other images can be recomposed. We preserve the whole of our experience and recall parts of it. Hegel's approach to the mind is antithetical to the contemporary cognitive scientist's analytic approach. Unfortunately, Hegel gives us no concrete suggestions about how to secure infinitary generative capacities without a set of elementary parts and combinatory operations.

It is intriguing to speculate about how Hegel would have considered an analogy drawn between the preservation of an image in this "abyss" of the mind and the preservation of a part of a picture in a hologram. There is no one-to-one correspondence between the

parts of an image generated from a hologram and the parts of the hologram itself; from any part of a hologram a complete, though less detailed, image is generable. Another model of "distributed representation" is offered by a new and fascinating branch of cognitive science—connectionism. Connectionist machines can perform apparently difficult and sophisticated tasks in real time by manipulating highly interconnected networks of very simple processors. Unlike standard algorithm-crunching von Neumann machines, there are no separable memory addresses for different pieces of information, either program or data. Whatever representations are attributed to the machine cannot be localized; they are distributed across the machine. It is possible that Hegel would have found even these analogies too materialistic in their treatment of mind, but perhaps such a treatment is still fitting at this low level of representation.

These potential images hidden within the intellect would be an empty fiction unless they could be actualized, but they can be actualized only in an intuition: "To have determinate being such an abstractly preserved image needs an intuition with determinate being. Recollection properly so called is the relation of the image to an intuition, in particular as the subsumption of the immediate singular intuition under what is universal in form, under the representation that has the same content" (§454, my tr.). In recollection proper (recollection₃) spirit gains control over the images within it, for they are no longer present as either isolated intuitions or mere potentialities of images. In recollection₃ the relation between these two aspects is brought to the fore, and this somehow gives spirit this control. The paragraph is rather murky, but what Hegel is getting at is that in recollection₁ there has to be an actual intuition present to the mind, and the potentialities discussed under the heading of recollection₂ can only find their actuality in those intuitions. Spirit can, however, produce this product on its own, rather than waiting for it to be elicited by the environment: "In recollection therefore, intelligence is within itself in the determinate sensation and its intuition, and recognizes them as already its own, while at the same time it now knows its image, which in the first instance is merely internal, to be also confirmed in the immediacy of the intuition" (§454). This phrasing is a little misleading, for recognition and knowing are sophisticated cognitive acts, well beyond the

powers of this level of spiritual activity. I shall return to the interpretation of this sense of recognition below. "The image, which in the abyss of intelligence was its property, is now, with the determination of externality, also in its [intelligence's] possession. It is thereby at the same time posited as distinguishable from the intuition and separable from the simple night in which it is at first immersed. Intelligence is therefore the power of being able to express what it possesses, and no longer to require external intuition in order to have this possession existing within itself" (§454, my tr.).

Two questions are raised in §454: (a) in what sense are these images general, and (b) what is the nature of the recognition we gain in recollection? The "abstractly preserved image" is the ability to generate the image, but insofar as this ability is itself something general, it is a general representation. But why is it that this descendant from a completely determinate intuition can be something general? There are two ways to understand this new generality, neither of which excludes the other. One of these involves a general point about the nature of abilities; the other involves the specific nature of images as Hegel conceives them.

First, there is something inherently general about abilities. Each actual action is fully determinate; it is an individual. But I do not think that we can make sense of having an ability that can logically be realized in one and only one fully determinate way. I might have the ability to commit suicide at 10:53 P.M. on March 23, 1989. Is this an ability that has only one possible realization? True, it is necessary that it can have only one actual realization, but there are still any number of fully determinate possible actions that would realize this ability. I could commit suicide with a knife, a gun, with sleeping pills, at home, in my car, sorrowfully, or gleefully. We could add all such conditions onto our specification of the ability, but there are always others left unspecified. If we attempt to avoid these considerations by picking some fully determinate possible action, naming it "Harry," and then saying that I have an ability to Harry, there are several replies to be made. First, the context "an ability to _____" takes a verbal-action description, not a name or singular term. Second, if we understand this ability as "the ability to perform Harry," there is an epistemological problem about assigning such an ability without assigning the more general ability to perform other Harry-like actions; our evidence could never be that complete.

Can we think of conditions under which "He has the ability to perform Harry" is justifiably assertable but "He has the ability to perform other Harry-like actions" is not? It seems to me that this makes sense only in a world so thoroughly determined that Harry is the only possibility given the whole state of the world. But if the events of this world are so thoroughly determined, it seems that the notion of an ability becomes trivialized, for things would only have "abilities" to do exactly those things they do. The abilities to construct images are standing abilities of spirit of which one realization does not exclude other earlier or later realizations (unlike the realization of an ability to commit suicide). Even though the image generated may be quite determinate, the same image can be generated again, and the generation of one particular image can also be a realization of several different abilities. In each case the realization is particular but the ability realized is general.

Second, an image, as we have seen, is an abstraction from the objective spatiotemporal order; but once we have abstracted from the spatiotemporal order and can no longer refer to it to individuate cases, the image can present any number of different objects. Locke, for instance, also saw this property of abstractions. As we shall see when we consider the imagination, the more we abstract not only from the object's spatiotemporal context but also from its own spatiotemporal features, the more suitable it becomes as a representation of a wide range of objects and properties. A recollection₃ of a triangle is general in being an ability to generate other perspectival views of the triangle, given the intuition of the triangle as stimulus. The image generated is general in the sense that only its internal properties are still fairly determinate, its spatiotemporal position and perhaps other individuating relational properties being abstracted from.

In recollection₃ we "subsume" an intuition under the abstract representation, and this constitutes a sort of low-grade *recognition* of the object. This is not full recognition, for no concepts are applied to the thing in this cognitive process. I have talked as if the one-time occurrence of an intuition is enough to preserve its image indelibly in the mind, and although this is theoretically true, from the practical standpoint it is too simple, as Hegel recognizes quite well. The strength with which a content is preserved is proportional to its repetitions within experience. "If I am to *preserve* something by

recollecting it therefore, I must have the intuition of it *repeated*. In the first instance of course, the image is revived not so much by me as by the immediate intuition corresponding to it. By means of being thus frequently elicited, however, it acquires within me such a liveliness and presence, that I no longer need the external intuition in order to recollect it" (§454, *Zusatz*). When this ability to call up an image on one's own has been developed, a new and higher stage of spirit, that of the reproductive imagination, has been reached.

We can give another sense to the way a "general" representation—this ability to construct an image—subsumes an intuition, and to the way we recognize the intuition as one we have already had. It must be clear that we do not hold one intuition up against an image and compare the two, deciding that they are the same or that one is a specification of the other. Generally speaking, one thing is subsumed under a second when the first is an *instance* of the second, and this approach can be extended fairly straightforwardly to the case at hand: an actualization of an ability is an instance of it, and a specific intuition is an instance of spirit's ability to construct such an image. This still leaves unanalyzed the manner in which spirit can recognize the content of an intuition as one it has encountered before.

That which is recognized as previously encountered, as our own, is what is familiar. It is easy to fall into the trap of thinking that recognizing something involves assigning it a linguistic or conceptual tag. The recognition we speak of here is definitely prelinguistic, of a sort we might also be able to assign to animals, for instance. Seeing something as familiar does not involve comparing it to any other representation or sticking a tag on it mentally, but, phenomenologically speaking, it is presuming to know how things stand, having certain definite expectations about what would happen if. . . . This form of knowing or recognition is founded on the immediate knowledge of ease in the performance of an ability. All explicit knowing *that* is founded on a set of epistemic skills, knowing *hows*.

If I am exercising a certain skill, I do not need to look at my actions to know what I am doing or what the result of my actions ought to be. Development of a skill brings along with it immediate, noninferential knowledge that the skill is being performed during the

performance. This does not mean that in the performance of the skill we are necessarily reflectively aware of the performance, but that when we do have such reflective awareness it is noninferential. Such awareness of ease in construction is immediate and noninferential, but it is not infallible, and it is based on our ability to habituate ourselves to the ordinary course of events. Through this process of familiarization and habituation, spirit gains control over its representations. There is no suggestion here that this is a will-ful learning process; at this stage we are confronted with a brute ability of spirit, one spirit can learn to control consciously, but one that does not depend on such conscious control. After repeated hearings, for instance, one can simply sing a song, without ever having made an effort to learn it. And there are different degrees to which the song can be mastered. Some people might require a good deal of prompting, that is, the repetition of part of the appropriate intuition, to be able to keep going with the song. Others eventually find no prompting at all necessary—they now know the song. Knowing a song is a knowing how, it is a skill, and the kind of knowledge of objects we possess in our recollective activities is a similar kind of knowing how. It is a kind of technical knowledge always limited by the immediate situation in its applicability and usefulness; it is not yet theoretical knowledge, which escapes the limitations of particular situations, transcending the dependence on particular sensate material that still characterizes recollection.