

Prologue: Introduction to and Summary of Sense-Certainty [§§ 90-94]

- a) [§90] Description of the basic shape of sense-certainty in terms of immediacy or receptivity and apprehension rather than comprehension.
- b) [§91] Description of the basic structure of the object and the subject according to sense-certainty.
- c) [§92] An objection to sense-certainty.
- d) [§93] Description of this mediation as it appears within consciousness, which is object-directed. H calls the object “the essence” and the subject “the unessential.”
- e) [§94] Main Question: Is the object what it is claimed to be in self-certainty? Answer must be developed with the materials provided by self-certainty itself, not from without.

A. The Dialectic of the Object [§§ 95-100]

- a) [§95] After first distinguishing between two aspects of “This,” the “Now” and the “Here”, H asks: “What is now?”. Answer: “Now is night”. Three problems then arise:
 - i) Truth value is not preserved.
 - ii) [§96] Meaning of “Now” is preserved.
 - iii) The true meaning of “Now” is that of an abstract and empty universal.
- b) [§97] Diagnosis is that we can never say what we mean as the content of sense-certainty. Language must use universals and therefore we can never express particulars.
- c) [§98] The same holds for “Here” as did for “Now”.
- d) [§99] Conclusion: The essence of sense-certainty remains pure being, but it loses its immediacy, since it requires universality, which involves negation and mediation.
- e) [§100] Transition: At first, the object is the essential element of sense-certainty and the subject is the inessential. However, a reversal occurs here. The object is now the inessential element, and the subject is essential. This leads to the Dialectic of the Subject.

B. The Dialectic of the Subject [§§ 101-102]

- a) [§101] H makes the same points about the “I” that he made about “This” and “Now”.
 - i) “I” does not preserve its truth value.
 - ii) [§102] “I” has the same meaning, despite the fact that it is used in different contexts.
 - iii) The actual meaning of “I” is that of an abstract and empty universal.
- b) Consequence: We can never say what we mean, which is supposed to be particular, and the richness in content that we’re supposed to get with our immediate access to pure being is lost in an empty abstraction.

C. The Dialectic of Sense-Certainty as a Whole or Subject-Object [§§ 103-108]

- a) [§103] Transition from Dialectic of the Subject to the Dialectic of the Whole.
- b) [§§104-105] Specific description of what this shape of consciousness needs to be.
 - i) [§104] No distinction between subject and object (both are essential)
 - ii) No plurality of uses (“stick firmly to one immediate relation”) and therefore no negation.
 - iii) [§105] We approach this immediate relation and point to it, occupying its “spatio-temporal-subject” point.
- c) [§§106-108] Specific description of what sense-certainty actually experiences.
 - i) [§106] Experience of pointing to the one spatio-temporal-subject point as being, has been and not-being.
 - ii) [§107] This “movement” reveals that the pointing and the temporal-subject point stand in a complex, not immediate relation. As a result, one must engage in “reflection” to grasp its complexity.
 - iii) So, Now turns out to be a plurality of Nows and is therefore a universal.
 - iv) [§108] Same points hold for “Here” and spatial-subject points as did for “Now” and temporal-subject points.

Epilogue/Transition to Perception [§§ 109-110]

- a) [§109] Sense-Certainty says the opposite of what it wants to say. It purports to grasp the particular immediately and with certainty, but in reality it can represent only universals and its objects are transitory, not permanent.
- b) [§110] All language is inherently universal, so it is impossible to use it to express the particular, individuating features of reality. However, to represent something by way of universals is simply to perceive it. So Sense-Certainty inevitably leads to a new model of knowing or consciousness, namely Perception.