II THE HORIZON STRUCTURE OF THE WORLD-EXPERIENCE AND OF THE EXPERIENECE OF REAL THINGS WITHIN THE WORLD

Nr.9

Interpretation of the logical ideas “real thing within the world”, and “world itself”. <World as experiential horizon, and world as logical idea. Logical horizon and world-concept. Concept of the totality of the real thing, and concept of the totality of the world>[[1]](#footnote-1)

The world is not in the same sense a “substance” as a single “real thing” is a substance. The determination of something real essentially leads to inner as well as outer infinities, thus in the last respect the horizon of the totality “world”, which after all is nothing else but totality, an allness of realities, is necessarily already presupposed. Or it is the allness of “finite” “substances” each of which is “substance” with respect to its corresponding determinations that are to be brought about from its respective prior givenness.

The being of each real thing is a being through anticipation, being from a respective givenness which necessarily is a prior givenness at the same time, and so on in infinitum. The givenness essentially implies the potentiality of the positing of being that judges, and [the positing of being ] that aims at true being. From there the idea of this real thing’s true being in the totality of its truth[[2]](#footnote-2) is *a priori* predelineated. On the basis of experience, of pre-giving anticipation, and in the continuity of inner and outer determination with **[68]** judging-cognizing intention together with the concluding and-so-forth the logical form of the substrate arises as [the substrate] of its determinations’ total infinity. But that is a **logical product**, an essentially possible [product] on the basis of experience, of the horizonedness <belonging to> the experience as consideration respectively directed towards this real thing, [a consideration] that proceeds, again and again predelineates, and always – even prior to a certain predelineation – already has a horizon, but that therefore is not yet construction of the idea that is only actualized as a constructive product.

Each real thing has its external as well as its internal horizon, its surroundings of other real things, of determined as well as undetermined ones, of real <and> possible [real things]. Thus it is necessarily **given-pregiven**. This is the presupposition in order to be able to enter external determinations of each real thing, to search and find them. Essentially this implies the potentiality to be able to go on to other real things, to be able to determine them, and to form them synthetically on higher founding levels of a categorically higher level that as one relate to multiple realities in ever new pluralities and pluralities of pluralities.

The world is not experienced, not to be determined by way of experience like a real thing in the common sense of a “thing” [is], it [the world] is not given-pregiven like such [a thing]. Prior to its givenness there is the givenness of single real things. In the transition from one real thing to another real thing of its surroundings, and thus to ever new surroundings, and [to ever new] real things a **synthetic experience** is effected which is an experience after all, and not a judging-combining action. This transition within the experiencing Ego (but then again in the inter-subjectivity that is connected through experience) is sometimes brought about arbitrarily within a limitation of the circumspection (to which purposes ever: be it <out of > mere “curiosity”, or <due to> a practice requiring it). But apart from that, the life of the subjectivity as [a life] continuously experiencing is at the same time [a life] continuously advancing from surroundings to surroundings in unitary synthesis, whereby each **[69]** currently compelling thing has its background within this synthetic continuation; each field of perception for example has its horizon of anticipation of new fields of perception in a synthetic unit, thus for memory, etc. This is **all-embracing experience,** and in a certain sense it is always already **world-experience**, insofar as everything that is grasped thereby goes into habitual knowledge, and [insofar as] even everything that is not grasped brings into effect its vaguely undetermined, ungrasped sense, [and] contributes to the intentional unity effect.

But this implies the **potentiality** of the judging-positing grasping of the world, of the logical construction of the **idea** “world” as **logical idea,** and initially as of a logical substrate, that is of a substrate for predications. Now the single real things as logical substrates are the beginning, and their continuous collective combination with the concluding and-so-forth leads on; but eventually the “everything”, completing the idea of the world as totality, must join in. Thus: the unity of experience belonging to the (intersubjective) unity of alert life precedes, and the pre-logical unity of the objects determined by way of pre-logical experience, and the objects indeterminately anticipated as horizon, each of which carries along its own horizon that for its part intermingles with the horizons of other objects. – Unity of the all-embracing “association”.

On this basis then “logical” **activity,** and **logically formed** [objectivities], that is, **proper objectivities**, and initially “things”, realities for a categorically combining <activity> grasping itself. To each <real thing> belongs the constructing idea of its complete being (in truth), either relatively within the limitation of a situation, or eventually totally for the scientist (purely logical idea of the totality of the being). Due to logical activities – since we humans (we mature humans) have always been active in a logical, judgingly cognizing way, and in between time and again always are [active in that way] – due to that, I say, each experienced thing holds its own **logical horizon**, but as a founded one, a horizon of second order. We could say “conceptual” instead of “logical”. Concept of the real thing as a substrate. World at last. **The world-concept is a “logical” entity of a higher order** (not an entity of the learned logician, or of the logic as discipline) – the concept of “allness of realities”, whereby “realities” means real substrates as “logical” objects, as objects **[70]** presupposed already as achievement of the judgment, or as achievement of cognition. We mature humans (of the European culture) all have this concept of “world” already; and while considering the world, it is not the “notion “world”” that guides us as unity of mere experience, but the “well-known”, “in vagueness emerging” concept “world”. We explain it [the concept], clarify it, like other logical categorialia we have as habitual property at our command.

To be distinguished: Everything is already conceived of as continuously judgeable, as something one can be concerned with, and the truth of which (the truth of the situation) one can ask for – in respective experiences. But the idea of a being within the endless totality of its determinations thereby is (not yet) constructed. We have the Something as a judgment-substrate with a horizon of possible further determinations “vaguely” – contrary to that as exact scientist (we have) as guiding <idea the> constructive idea of the totally determined being, and thus [we] also [have] the world as an All of being, this could mean: the definite idea of the being.

But thereby we are not ready yet. The infinity implies paradoxes as soon as we complete it, and let it become a totality. The single real thing logically determines itself within the and-so-forth. But its total determination presupposes an allness of the other real things to be a valid idea, or that the world as a totality was this [a valid idea], <that> the world-concept was valid. **The concept of the totality of the real thing presupposes the [concept of the totality] of the world,** that is, also with regard to validity. **But conversely this [concept] presupposes that one**. In their validity the concepts refer us to the original intentionality, the [intentionality] of the experience, from which a real thing should emerge as a being – this in their presumption which always implies a new presumption, fulfilling itself in consequent unanimity; and the presumption is an inner as well as an outer one. Each presumptive positing is dependent, necessarily it has its horizon, points to a continuity of unanimity that has to prove itself as an experiencing one. But probation is already predelineated through correction itself, that is, the anticipation itself is in a certain sense already legitimate, namely [it is] already **pre-experience** as a mode of experience, <as> self-giving not of self-presence, but of prospectiveness, of the prospective accessibility, probably along with a correction in the “different”, whereby the being proved itself after all.

**[71]** But we have to proceed from here. The style of the experience of something real is as apperception predelineated regarding its form, and this predelineation in its formal universality has to be interpreted more closely. But here comes into question that this style itself is flexible, that it can within the course of further experience change itself, but in a way that does not disclose the former style, but lifts it to a new level. Within the **experiential surroundings that have become normal**, each environmental real thing has a uniform meaning from the spatial general style of reality experience, that is, of presumptive unanimity belonging to that normality.[[3]](#footnote-3)

“Thing” in the “everyday” life is an index of this style that makes itself individually special, and according to the form predelineates the already known, the having become known, the unknown. But the normal surroundings, or rather, the unitarily experiencing apperception is not rigid. The experience of the surroundings, and in it each unitary apperception of a single real thing comes into motion by way of certain experiences, complete experiences,or rather single experiences changing the style of the surroundings itself, while unanimity of the complete experience and thereby unity of the world remains as a constituted correlate after all. Thus by involving anomalies within the general style of a higher normality. What we call “normal world” thus already includes anomalies that have only been acquired through inclusion, or rather, that intentionally reveal their founded character. This also belongs here: extension of normal surroundings relating to a personality through association with other personalities (peoples, cultures), with other surroundings, like e.g. the development of a unitary mundane world (as becoming normal) for the whole mundane humanity.

When some kind of experience of real objectivity (human being, animal, stone, or a mere thing, etc.) becomes a “transcendental guidance” then this has to be understood as the experienced unity (the “objective” correlate of unanimity within the continuous streaming of experience) given within live experience is given as an example of the type (in the attitude towards the type being no “concept”). Now we find belonging to the type the typical qualitied structure by way of explication, or rather, [we find] the corresponding **[72]** plural affection which we, following <it>, explicate. This interpretation of the structure of the object’s type (grasped at the example in typical attitude) reveals the objective style as the [style] of possible experiential directions; and this is just then the guidance for the noetic interpretation of the constituting appearances and egoical occurrences belonging to an unanimous experience in a noetic way. But initially this subjective does not come into question, but only the explication of the experienced object in its properties as [properties] of possible experience. Only this possible experience does not imply anything else but possible explication within the guiding type that on its part is predelineated as component of the “normal” surroundings.

In the extension of the surroundings through synthesis of relative surroundings nature then differentiates itself as identifying structure which is always a presupposition, a basis for the predicates of the objective mind. Nature also includes persons here, and then differentiates itself into the ground nature (territory), the physical, and the egoical mentality. With the continuation towards universality, towards infinity as totality which is in relation to thinking a subsequent presumption, the idea (a concept) within the totality of unanimous experience arises to presuppose pure endless nature as the same for all conceivable experiencing subjects, and to construct it conceptually, and therein the purely physical nature, “within” which distributed psychic subjects embody themselves.[[4]](#footnote-4) The paradoxes of infinity turn up.

We construct the world of realities within the description of ont<ic> contents of the streaming total experience and their things belonging to the surrounding world together with their syntheses as pure subjectively “irrelative” “nature”.[[5]](#footnote-5) The ongoing temporalization, in which the world of temporal facts (the world of unconditionally objective facts)eventually constitutes itself as an endless totality, this temporalization is the ontic temporalization; the onta here are the relatively constituted objects of the world and worlds (worlds of situations, “subjective-relative” in a certain sense). A second sense of “objective fact” is the [sense] of the objective mind’s facts which are essentially **[73]** related to subjects and communities of subjects, but in this relation become themselves generally only accessible by way of history: as an idea of its own. Objective mentality relates to the human who sets himself goals.[[6]](#footnote-6) Human communities as well do set themselves goals, and act accordingly in the pregiven nature and the cultural world and transform it. But man can also set himself unconditional goals; as a human he has such goals, such goals belong to his essence, or rather, corresponding [to such goals] absolute demands [do belong to his essence]. But this results in the possibility to form a practical total idea as an absolute [idea]: idea of a total humanity of a total “endless” world intending to form this world according to the endlessly remote idea of an absolutely obligatorily total human [world].

Appendix V

Horizon consciousness of the world, and thematic idea of the world

<Objectivation of a physical thing in contrast to idea of the world: world experience and world certainty>[[7]](#footnote-7)

*<Content:> World as something wherein all being (for me certain of being) is inexistent. In this sense the world is not a being, not a real thing, and world experience has a new sense. Construction of the world as an open-endless plurality, allness of real things. World as totality, theme of the world science (cosmology).*

Whatever I am thematically occupied with, it is conscious to me **as being within the world**. I have always, with each and everything, a certainty of the world’s being. I do have it *a priori* of each single experience, of each single field of perception, of each single theme – at everything as a horizon certainty, and running through the change of theme, in continuous constancy. This implies the certainty of my constant facultative ability to get clear about the mere “horizon-consciousness” of the world as of the [world] being certain for me through the respective existence-sense, by illustrating it with an explicit idea of the world, and possibly in the mode of an intuitional [idea of the world]. I do have respectively, and whenever I take over this sense-investigation, my **[74]** (respective) field of perception, possibly an intuitive field of memory (or in a volatile way a succession of such fields), and thereby [I take over] for me a circle in individual determination <of being things> as individual constellation of “things” being (present, having been present, etc.) - but within the horizon-consciousness as things “within” the world, **from** the world. From there the experience goes on within the change of these fields. Within experience I have these things as bodily themselves (present themselves or represented themselves as having been perceived, etc.). And while I am there with them themselves, I get to know them in their being thus, or I recognize them explicitly the way they are (and the way they were known to me already previously) – thus with well-known, familiar things.

But I can also channel my real experience, I can <continue> while learning or else recognizing, and extend my circle of things really experienced by me, individually determined, coming to self-grasping, and, where I am inhibited to continue freely, [I can] gain experience mediately through the information of others, not only understanding it, but also taking it over for me in acceptance of being. Everything that thereby becomes certain to me in its factual reality, and, where it is or insofar as it is still unknown, [everything that] becomes known to me has **certainty** (as certainty-modality), [has] its habitual being-for-me in certainty (in always to be repeated [certainty]). Certainty as original mode of certainty is in itself certainty-modality insofar as (like I always already know) simple certainty could suffer a split, and could become doubt, supposition, nay [could become]not-being. **Every single thing being for me thus is kept in suspense between being and not-being**, also where I do not really doubt whether it is or is not. But I also “know” that we need not let the matter rest at a modality of uncertainty, [I know] that it is possible, and lying within my ability (possibly in a nexus with others), to get back to certainty in the form of “And yet it is”, or “It still is thus”, or “It is not thus and thus but instead (there and then) there is this other thing”. **I am constantly in a world certainty** – completely certain that eventually the circle of what can be experienced is to be brought into a **unity of an unanimity of experience**, [a unity] in which everything that can be experienced should agree in continuous certainty. And always a realm of unbroken certainty is the basis that mere presumabilities, possibilities, doubtfulnesses presuppose as normal occurrences. They are corrected by themselves, or, where I am especially interested in the certainty of being, through channeling the experience on purpose. The world is constantly, while being for me as partly already unanimously certain of being, partly still being **corrected**, in the relevant details to be inserted into the already being certain. **[75]** And thereby it is **constantly on its way to an unanimous total certainty of being**, a totality of really being and established real things.

Thus is the process of the experiential activity resulting in “true” being – individually determined, acquired and to be acquired as knowledge –, that is, as activity of getting to know the factual world, how the world is de facto, in its individual factualness. But continuous experience, and even a purposely continuing experience is in need of a guidance through anticipating conception, quasi a pre-conception if proper conception means the “having-put-before-oneself” that has come about within grasping. Continuous experience is limited, and the wish to get to know the world experientially means entering the pre-given, horizon conscious surroundings, that, however they mediately might draw in experiences through the others who experience, remain bound in finitude, although in a finitude that does not have a last step, but is an open finitude and open infinity in one.

Each ordered advance into the vastness, and from vastness to vastness, already presupposes a delineating making objective, an anticipating, pre-representing objectivation, and not as mere fantasying, but rather as a **pre-conception** of something individual within a certainty of being which only has the character of a certain anticipation where something already known is concerned. Instead it is else and it is as unknown world horizon a representation indeed which, even if it represents something individual, makes it intuited in the new way of an individual example, of an individual possibility from an open range of possibilities.

Each practice presupposes a proposal, a pre-conception, an eventually concise and clear pre-objectivation. But it is also within the most perfect clarity according to individual factualness undetermined within the open range of possibilities that simply remain undetermined, in suspense, without the decision that only de facto experience and cognition can bring along.

Properly speaking this is the character of each pre-expectation (anticipation), that, however determined it may be, necessarily has an **open range of what is not completely determined**. But on closer consideration it could be objected that it is also the basic character of experience, even within the original mode of perception to anticipate the content of its experience while at the same time allotting to it [to the content] the mode of having something itself. However, each pre-representation obviously has the peculiarity of an intentional mediateness, of an intentional modification, in which the modified, that it [the pre-representation] has conscious in its being changed, is just an experience together with the anticipation that is proper to it in the original mode. We have immediate experience – and **[76]** the immediately actualizing doing (also [the] acting realization) belongs here – and a preconception, the jutting pre-representation of a future or possibly future experience and actualization.

But not only am I able to construct <a> preconception of the next thing that is actual for me (within the open range of possibilities), I can construct an “idea of the world” as a draft: world “in advance” objectivated within its possibilities. I can construct the world in advance within the possibilities of actualness from every experience, and from the experience of its surroundings as an “objectivated” world, as a respective idea of the world, and [I can] have the identical world as objective within the optionally renewed construction and reconstruction, and from this world certainty [I can] conduct through anticipation the way of a world cognition [starting] from the “given” - <with the given> as guidance.

**It is only from this idea of the world that “world” does have an explicit meaning for me**. But this [idea of the world] is in a certain sense something ambiguous. If I “repeat” the idea of the world by originally forming, then in truth it is not the same; apart from the fact that my immediately intuitive and already effective living surroundings – the way they are respectively already awakened in the interest of my current practical intentions and [the way they] have their form of attention – do change, I will also in a new formation of the idea of the world not pursue exactly the same ways, that is, I will pursue other ways. And still I arrive at the idea of the world, at the objectivation of **the same** world, of the one that encompasses every real thing. And within the transition from one formation to another or in memory of previous ones I have to state in synthetic identification: “the same world”, and [I must] say to myself: I can only conceive an idea of the world, an explicit objectivation, within these transiencies of ever different and yet through evident identification connected objectivational constructions. Like an objectivation in general I do not have the **idea of the world** merely as a current experience, as a product, but as a **property** acquired from production. I experience a single thing, and I gain an objectivation of it by way of “interpreting” its being within the being thus. Accordingly I acquire an explicit being, the original cognizance of it as to what it is; and the cognizance is my current **acquisition**: I can either make it intuitive once more in the repetition of the current certainty of its being within the being thus. Likewise the idea of the world. If I did not form it I would not know anything about this world. The current and intuitively performed idea of the world is: to currently bring to original cognizance the being of the world. And properly speaking this is already the original shape of the **knowledge** of the world. The expression “world” has its meaning simply because it is stated what this objectivation intuitively teaches. But the expression is taken **broadly** **[77]** by calling the objectivated within the endless mobility of its emerging contents an identical of its ontological style. (That of course is incomplete.)

The idea of the world is the basis for all conceptual knowledge of the world, for all sciences relating to the world, the actual [world] as well as the as possible conceivable [world]. Through this we gain ideas of the world of a new, founded kind: world concepts, world cognition, theories, scientific doctrinal systems.

But now there are some doubts. Is the explicit idea of the world really equal to the idea of a physical thing, to the idea of something real? Is the world not the allness of real things, and is not a comprehensive experience, including all single experiences of real things, necessary for an original “objectivation” of the world, that is, <for> an experience of the world? I only have experience of the world in that way that I have my total scope of actually experienced things in its transiency and in continuation, and [that] at the same time [I have] the consciousness that I could possibly go on, and could go on in different directions. It is exactly this consciousness that I can get clear about in advance, my possibilities to go on, and that I thus get clear that I am able to pre-design everything I have in advance as something possibly to be attained (in my abilities), and (everything that) can be accepted by me respectively. On the other hand: Actual experience of a thing does have its openness, its horizon, and there as well <I do have> the possibility to be able to objectivate in advance the direction of my possible going on, and the style of possibilities.

At once the following specification is necessary to make distinct what it means to get explicitly clear of and to make distinct the world experience:

First. In a certain way we always have a world experience where we are occupied *specialiter* with something real, only that thereby <that> which is also within the experiential field of other real things is an unthematic background, and [that] at the same time an unintuitive horizon consciousness is <present>,, indivisible of the thematic within the thematic background, whereby this whole complex has the meaning of “experience of the world”. Thus also the experience of a physical thing has within the process of explication different themes and something intuitional with an unintuitive horizon, but of course <in such a way> that a unity of theme goes through all this.

We have to alter the normal occupation with real single things of the world. By changing the attitude, and only thereby – by way of “comprehending” from the respective intuitive core of the complete intuitional that flowingly changes, from the “comprehensible” as springboard – <we> need to “invade” its horizon, and to run through its possibilities, or rather the totality of directions of our possible experience, **[78]** etc. Here is to be presented: <the> concept of the **integral** **survey**, the “comprehension”, the passing-on in all directions to possible experience.

One should not wish to blur essential differences. Certainly it is true: What I respectively perceive and actually experience is a mere snippet of the world. And again: Each single thing being the object of my active experience and of my other occupation, is necessarily a thing of the world. Certainly it is true: Whatever I experience, I also have a certain consciousness of the world, namely a horizon consciousness of a consultable “beyond that”. On the other hand the original source of all these speeches is not to be neglected. Physical things are objects of possible experience, objects of a possible activity, occupation. As something being for us they have their source in actions, in themes: or: experience of a physical thing has its source attributed to affection, devotion, identification in the recognition as being the same thing, etc. Physical things are for us just [existent] through gradual act-productivity with its kept results, but as results of act-productivities, of treading the path towards a goal by acting. Objects are current goals or [goals that] in acquired potentiality or habituality [are] proper to us. The constitution of things, the [constitution] of things as experiential goals (those of specific experience of physical things) does not yet require anything of a world constitution in a parallel sense (or of a world experience, world apperception towards or next to <the> thing experience). World as horizon of physical experience and of this as experience within a physical perceptional field, of a physical constellation, etc. is not yet **world experience** to which belongs an objectivation of its own, identification, recognition, etc.

But how does the constitution of the world look like as an **All**, <how> its **objectification**? What shall its source be like as “object” during the essential proceeding of the things’ or pre-things’ constitution?

**Individuation emerges together with the formation of a horizon**. Plurality, a plurality <emerges> in gradual collecting, in mere, in gradual grasping: a single thing, then “again” a single similar thing: plural, a configuration anticipated as plural, “nominalization”. Any a, any b. Different configurations “regarded” as pluralities, anticipated, as respectively producible in similar repeated grasping and keeping, but different in coincidence: a and b, each a, each b.

Explication while running through group a: Some are a, some are b; each and each an a is always m – all a are m; plurality as unity, plurality among pluralities. Open pluralities, open plurals: humans, oxen. Of occurrences: it is raining, it is snowing, occasionally the one or the other is repeated. **[79]** In the “course of the world”, in the course of time, “within the “wide world” there are all sorts of things, all sorts of things happen”. The experiencing life, life within the continuation of activity, from grasping and explication of the grasped to new grasping and explication while keeping it and furthermore owning it: the concrete “intuitional” field of experience within the “anticipation” as graspable, explicable, identifiable, etc., one after the other. – A life within the course of these activities, [in the course of] their changes in keepings, within the course of acquisitions as unities, [a life] that always repeats itself in style, and yet is a coherent subjective occurrence, and a continuously developing, continuously unifying streaming unity of acquirements that connect with each other within retaining, but not only that, <also [a streaming unity]> of the anticipated multiplicities of acquirements and re-acquirements that possibly need to be dedicated anew. Each [is] identifiable as the same individual according to the space-time-point, as something in itself, etc. I can reflect on this stream of the being that is current and optional for me, how it [the stream] presents itself in advance, beforehand; I can, instead of being further active therein, in the interest of the day, etc., keep still and **look around, overlook**, and perform only acts that serve this, I can enter the past of memory, practice an all-embracing review, and an all-embracing prospect, thereby consider the directions of my ability to proceed, to alternate and [I can also] consider the possible systematic modifications of this streaming, and thereby gain an overview over the possible acquirements. But everything is already predesigned in undetermined universality, in the ontological form “world”.

To conceive an idea in advance of what implicitly lies within the always imperfect, flowing experiential certainty (in the course of de facto explication, and then in the imperfect de facto acquirement of experiential cognition) – as anticipation of what the physical thing itself is “in its entirety” or “completely”. Likewise to conceive in advance an idea of the world that in awake consciousness, although not (not in the form “all-unity of the beings”) thematically, is always experienced. It is imperfect since it is a mere snippet of the “allness” that is actually experienced, and because each single thing itself has its imperfection within the experience.

This is the “**systematic” construction of the possible experiences’ infinity**. This implies: The exhibition of an apriori hierarchical order of the systems of direction is needed, in which [in the systems] I am able to proceed in an experiencing way, and thereby, coming from the already contentually experienced, and then “conceived” as experienced things, necessarily gain my contentual predelineation for the advancing real thing, and its now to be experienced sides and ways of appearance: the systems of direction, the systems of subjective possibilities of access. It is to be exhibited soon that the system is predelineated *a* **[80]** *priori*, and already familiar within the actual experienced, [it is] just not interpreted. But the task is to exhibit, apart from the multiplicity of possible experiences as appearances, the possibilities of the accesses, the directions of the process in its foundation as well:

1) Primordially the kin<aesthetical> system and its subsystems. The system of the experiencing memory as a system of giving access for the primordial “world’s” past to its former times and from those former times to the presence.

2) This receives an intersubjective importance within the circle of original empathy. But the system of giving access corresponding to the systematic mediateness of empathy is new. Others again and again having others that they themselves (or rather I) do not have, and higher level systems giving access (extension of the space- and space-time-constitution through the others of the others, etc.) – on the way of making known of not present others within the material sphere as expression and indication of their having-been-active; and then communicating expression: the next, direct nexus with present others through immediate bodily-communicating expression (then possibly within materiality as well) becomes the nexus with those who are not present; and from there the reiterated possibility of their nexus creates itself, etc. Furthermore: Monuments and linguistic ways of making known in a documented form create a nexus between those present and in general co-present and the future ones or rather the past ones. Plato, insofar as he published scripts in which he addresses his future readers, was speaking “directly” with me while I was reading.

Especially systematic of generations and generative combinations.

Systematic structure of what belongs to the surrounding world, and of the open world within that what belongs to the surrounding world, <of the> access’s systems of direction. – But the path belonging to the possible beings in their systematic, implies their system of modes of appearances in the directions of their accessibility by way of kinestheses in the widest sense. **[81]**

Appendix VI

Experience as method of the cognizance of single physical things.

World experience – Single experience.

World consciousness as horizon in contrast to “world experience”[[8]](#footnote-8)

The explicating perception of a corporeal thing, the organismal processes as practicing real causality at the same time remain unnoticed. Also there where we cut open or break the inner part of a thing in order to get to know it, we do not make this causality a theme, [we] do not insert it into the explication’s content. We utilize it as if it was a mere folding out like of a bowl’s or a box’s lid. But even that is a really changing process that like a mere move of the eyes or a mere palpating do not really count. Similarly even while lifting a thing, while taking it in order to regard it and then putting it back on its place. The real change of place is disregarded, it is not a theme in case that it is vital to get to know the thing the way it is and [the way] it has been (the way it has been [while remaining] at its place, and the way it again will be at its place as long as it is not moved and changed subjectively).

The thing as it is is synthetically constituted through such subjective doing; its being-sense as a thing of possible experience has such subjective processes of performance, has the subjectivity possibly functioning in an experiencing way as essential correlate. But thus is the constitution of the thing as of a thing in the world, that the functioning subject and its co-subjectivity are always constituted as psychophysical humanity within the connection of the whole constituting life, whereby the corporeal bodiliness is integrated into a universal causality which of course usually is “marginal” within a basic sphere of body-perception (namely the superficial [body-perception]), at any rate changing place and quality of the thematic “extra-essentially”. Walking, an indispensable kinesthesis within perception, produces noises, familiar ones and indifferent ones – except in the case that currently the noise is the theme, or, like we could also say, [in the case that the noise] is of interest.

Perceiving in the proper, in the normal sense as getting to know in an interpreting way has its universal essential property for natural objects in correlation to its ontological (the essentially universally constituted) structure; it is the correlative essentially universal method to get to know natural objects through their “properties”, and to get to know nature in general – **[82]** also the natural objects’ changing themselves in an ordered way according to their objective circumstances: the ordered modes of connecting, dividing, merging, of the ordered movement in mechanical causality, etc. This means: to perform a perceiving in the wider sense – within the co-human nexus. Thus it is nothing else but to bring into play in a special case the method of possible experience, [the method] that is correlative to the being-sense of nature (the naturally-ontologically universal [being-sense]). Nature is that which is respectively (perceptually, memorially) given to us with a core of immediate intuitiveness within a horizonedness according to which a systematic continuation of the perception is needed to advance in grades of perfection to what it is itself. What it is itself is respectively what comes to fulfilling itself-givenness. In an indirect way we approach this self through inducing, i.e. by way of an induction that fills the in an undetermined way generally fore-meant with a certain content of anticipation, that is, in the mode of a “pre-memory”, of a certain pre-intuition, that is, within the method, certain of being, of a pre-fulfilling which shows us beforehand (without our being present ourselves) in an illustrating way how the physical real thing has to be assumed, <what> it has to be regarded as. Certainly, induction can never accomplish as much as direct experience; but where direct experience is excluded, it serves our practice and our cognitional striving, insofar as it has its mode of systematic proving within the extended nexus of experience that includes such induction.

Nature (and accordingly the world in general) is constantly perceived and otherwise experienced by me, constantly as a being-sense lying within it [within nature], constantly coming to acceptance of being within my activity. But that which thus is “actually given” as being itself present within this active acceptance of being is at the same time anticipation, horizoned, “vague” co-acceptance furnished with little predelineation, anticipation of a possibly to be realized fulfilling through actual experience. We say of nature, of the world this over there was given in current experience, this had entered experience. The horizon is equivalent to the facultative possibility to channel further experience voluntarily, and to systematically bring to making intuitive beforehand the therein implied attendant meaning in its totality, that is, [to bring it] to that form of intuition in which the fulfilling intuition is predelineated in certainty. But this predelineation of fulfillment is ambiguous, it gives the range of imaginable possibilities of experience and data of experience in which the always only in an undetermined way generally, vaguely and as empty anticipated world (conscious in a horizoned way) has the totality of its fulfillments, that are possible in disjunctive certainty, in each actual experience, whereby thus is always certain in advance that one of these possibilities comes to unanimous and to be proved fulfillment within the course of experience, **[83]** but it is not determined which one.[[9]](#footnote-9) The world is constituted. The intuitional illustration of the world, as to what it possibly is like while it is always unknown, imperfectly known, is construction of the method in which the world as opinion should come to its self-being for us.

The world is constituted as being – as being all-unity of realities being in themselves. It is a constituted “produced formation” within the flowing world constituting subjectivity, but not as a complete [formation] which is to be equated with what we have acquired within the naivety of the natural world life as something that has become accomplished through producing and is now complete. However, complete is always, and always having been complete <is> the being-sense “being all-unity of realities being in themselves”. But it is a being-sense, something constantly being valid within the flowing constitution, just like a being-sense, that is, within the continuity of the game of fulfilled pre-acceptance and unfulfilled anticipating acceptance.

Yet it should not be overlooked: the world is not constituted the way that single real things are; originally it is a continuously changing and yet remaining unified horizon within a respective single real thing, a horizon that is not a theme. To make the world a theme and in a certain way to take an experiencing direction towards the world, to wish to get to know the world through “experiencing”, to wish to make intuited the world as a universe of possible experience – all this precedes the world horizon that is not a theme. And thus the problem of horizon remains here next to the problem presenting itself under the title “world experience”.

1. Probably 1932 – Concerning the horizon structure of experience as an element of action see text no. 37 – editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Within the continuous explication of the experienced there is a continuous coincidence; the identical as [the identical] of its determinations, and an open horizon of further possible determinations do stand out. Something new is construction of the idea: the formation of the “I am able to continue determining in that way”, or rather the identical as [the identical] of the infinity of its determinations to be brought about. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Normality – anomality. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Nature as territory of one, of my humanity, nature as synthesis of possible territories by way of the luminaries. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The psychophysic totality of Nature. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Also the goal to form human communities. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. December 1933 or January 1934 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. December 1933 or January 1934 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Yet this is reflection that makes the world already a theme due to the world horizon that precedes as world consciousness being not a theme. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)