No. 10

<The flowing world-consciousness that by way of modalizations remains in unanimity with its empathy horizon and its temporal horizon>[[1]](#footnote-1)

*<Content:> The concrete flowing world consciousness, the concrete world experience. Therein the salient concrete single real experiences.* ***Reduction to pure experience****. Thereby the concept of perception and experience branches out – be it as perception and experience in general, be it as pure perception, pure experience – noetically and noematically. Perception as perceiving and as perceived, the object within the What and the How. Givenness of sides, near-and-far-orientation, differentiation of the modes of acceptance. Its pure and simple being, void illusion, etc. (possibility), modes of attention, [modes] of occupation. Equivocal talk of appearance encompassing all that. “Proper perception”, pure and simple perception (certainty of being) with the horizon of continuing acceptance, as far as it [the perception] reaches. Flowing world consciousness with the structure of unanimity and of the emerging modalizations.* ***Intersubjective****. Systematic analysis. Concrete world-consciousness in the certainty of being, initially consciousness of present (but con-implied past, etc.), included therein particular perceptions of present objects within the unity of a perception. Flowing. Immanent present, therein world present. But implied foreign present with foreign world present. Synthesis. Endless horizon of co-subjects. Synthesis of their life-streams implied in me as my unitary consciousness of world present in synthesis with synthetic multiplicities of foreign [consciousnesses?] implied therein. Unanimity – modalization. Intersubjective immanent temporalization and intersubjective objective time.* **[85]**

<§1.> The reduction to the world purely as world of experience < and to my concrete flowing world-perception>

Constantly for me and for us the world is experienced as the one in which we ourselves live as humans, in which we immerse ourselves, and to which we ourselves belong as world objects, as worldly realities, as experiential components.

“Experience” is an ambiguous expression due to essential reasons. Here it shall mean: the flowing concrete consciousness of originally conscious (perceived) world, or rather, of originally given world objectivities. This concrete, originally self-giving, perceiving world consciousness implies as co-accepted and in participation in this originality the continuity of my subjective past world consciousness, and therein again implied the horizonlike co-accepted past world perceptions of my experiencing comrades, likewise [the past world perceptions] of the past world subjects and their past perceptions, etc., whereby also the predelineated future of the coming course of perception (my own and foreign) is considered. All this is implied. The concrete waking world-consciousness and therein each separate consciousness of something real has elements of acceptance beyond the properly presenting-itself: the respectively “empty”, not intuitable opinions, among them as well the possibly theoretical opinions, that perhaps are unfounded opinions, irrelevant, foreign to intuition.[[2]](#footnote-2)

If we now separate this abstractively, or rather reduce abstractively the respective for us in a proper way conscientiously existent world to a world of pure perception, of pure experience then the abstractive deliberation branches off soon and the concept of perception and of experience branches off in a multiple way, also the concept of appearance, of the aspect of an object and of the world itself, and then in particular the talk of “pure” experience and the other concepts as “purely” grasped gain different meanings.

**[86]** Beforehand we pay attention to the fact that “perception” in general, be it concrete or in the sense of a purity, is ambiguous in one of those ambiguities that cannot be prevented here due to essential reasons. Perception as a concretely self-giving consciousness (as mentally living, as meaning [consciousness]), then ont(ically) perception as the object being conscious in the character of the “there itself”, [conscious] in originality, again perception as this perceived object, but in the What and How it is conscious in such a way that perceptions, modes of the What and How are distinguished within the self-givenness of the same object, whereas the perceived object remains the same. This now results in multiple differences, e.g. for the corporeality of an object. The differences of givenness of sides, the differences of the near-and-far-orientation, etc. do come into question, in the other direction the differences of the modes of acceptance, in the flowing change the occasional change of “pure and simple being” to “illusion” or else to the possibility of being, probability, doubtfulness. All these “perceptions” are also called “appearances”, and of course correlatively modes of the perceiving consciousness do correspond to them that equivocally are also called “perceptions”, each [are they] also [called] “appearances” (that is, “perception” sometimes as perceiving, sometimes as perceptional content in the other sense, appearance sometimes as appearing, sometimes as something appearing and this sometimes as appearing object pure and simple and appearing as something appearing within the How). Further that difference within the How is to be noted that perception once has the mode of the grasping [perception] in which the perceiving Ego is directed towards the given, and this itself in different modes (attention). On the other hand: opposed mode of the “negative” attention.

Furthermore: Perception in the pregnant sense is perception in the certainty’s mode of acceptance. Though we do not take offense at talking of deceptive perceptions, of perceptions of illusion, even there where we are conscious of the illusion as deceptive perception, where the acceptance of being thus is cancelled, again, when a perception shows itself afterwards to be illusionary, we say we did not actually perceive then, “it was”, we say, “not a perception properly speaking”. This pregnant concept of perception thus implies the being in the mode of the certainty of being as the primitive mode of all “modalities of being” as intentional **[87]** variants of the primitive mode. But at bottom there is more. Perception as current mental process is not everything; each acceptance as a mental process has its horizon of continuing acceptance. As soon as this instead of being taken over is rather broken and most of all cancelled in a new mental process, the former perception, despite having been perception in the certainty of being, is no longer called “perception”.

My concrete flowing world-perception now has its **horizon of** **pastness** of past world-perceptions streaming in a concrete way. Each wake phase of my life, of the memorially to be reproduced [life] was world-certainty like the current [wake phase] is world-certainty. But past perception is still valid as long as it has not experienced cancellations and modalizations in general, and still does [experience] retroactively, whereby the past perceptions are cancelled, or [whereby] it is still undecided whether they may be valid or not. A **process of modalization** runs through the perceiving world life as the retrospect reflection teaches without more ado, that is, as a process of correction with regard to the synthetic universe of perceptual acceptance. The world that within the process of world consciousness is accepted as originally given and that constantly creates its certainty of continuing acceptance, is exclusively meant and in certainty of acceptance as the world of perceptions remaining unmodalized, of the current ones, as long as they are unmodalized, and of all [perceptions] that have to be represented as former Now that now continue to be accepted. Thus it is within each Now, and thus it has been in each subjective past. But what at that time was accepted as actually perceived world within the concrete all-encompassing synthesis of the world-perceiving consciousness, and with regard to the inherent past world-perceptions as actually past world, world of “actual and proper” former perceptions, is not simply still accepted as actual world, due to the amendments that have meanwhile taken place, and have remained accepted themselves (that have not been withdrawn). **[88]**

<§2. The flowing world perception and its empathy horizon. Constituted therein an intersubjective present, and the world as the world of us all>

We will now consider what comes into question due to the horizons of actual and possible empathy that belong to my perceptually concrete world consciousness, and due to the unity of current and potential synthesis of my very own life of world consciousness with those many processes of world consciousness of those empathies’ fellow subjects. Here as well only that is accepted as actual world – our world not only mine – what is co-accepted by me within the uncovering of foreign perception, but also what shows itself in mutually made communal perception as being communally accepted and what goes on being accepted.

In which differentiations does this result? My concrete flowing present consciousness is perceiving <consciousness> of the world, that is, perceiving world present; it [the world] shows itself through original certainty of being. In this flowing present life– whereby we have to distinguish between my subjectively now happening life in its own immanent temporality and the therein conscious, therein “appearing” world present – manifold current recollections, and manifold other recollections possibly to be awakened by me are implied. And within the synthesis possibly to be made by me I am able to represent the course of the former streams of consciousness in an imperfect way as if to perfect it, and I can become aware that my **present consciousness**, and then each to be awakened former [consciousness] has a **horizon of the past**, of the **immanent past of my life**, - simply with the sense that what I can respectively bring to awakening and re-intuition is not all, but that I can do this again and again, going back, and from there advancing to the current present life in which each advancing eventually has to terminate. This subjective temporal **life stream** (my primordial) is pervasively, as far as possible recollection might reach, a **stream of world perceptions**; each phase as concrete present phase is, taken unitarily, **[89]** “world perception”, certainty of being of the content “world”. It is this at the same time in the way that it respectively entails a multiplicity of special perceptions, perceptions of objects of single worlds, combined in a synthetic unity, through which <it> is not a heap of single perceptions, but **a whole of perception: world perception**.

The single perceptions within it are dependent elements, like it can easily be shown on closer analysis. In this concrete flowing total perception new perceptions with their objects of perception enter, and others exit. Thus the “whole” does not resemble a single perception and its (as long as it keeps the mode of certainty) constantly identical object. But the universe of perception that changes in details still forms a present unity of giving of something-itself, that is, for world present as a whole [it] always [forms] a unity of certainty. But we need to explicitly satisfy this difference and the ever undifferentiated modalizations here.

We will heed that the **present of perception in its concretion implies current and potential empathy** as well and <that> thereby, through the proper kind of this new representations in contrast to those making conscious the past and the future of my own life, now foreign life present, and foreign life past and future as **implications** do emerge. I do not only have the synthesis of my “own” immanent time, in which <the> unity of my own life stream in its own life temporality is horizonlike constantly conscious as well within my life present, and [in which it is] conscious as to be memorially disclosed, but it is also within my life present, and belonging to each former life present also conscious in the way of a horizon that is to be disclosed, namely the **horizon of empathy**, by way of which the being and the consciousness life of foreign subjects of consciousness are there for me. I thus have within the unity of implication the unitary in itself synthetic coherence of my life in its flowing now as a having-flown and a will-flow; and when I “get myself into” the empathy everywhere belonging to this stream – similar to when I, getting myself involved into memories belonging to the Now, invade my own past from the [point of my] self-contained present **[90]** – I invade the (belonging to the implication of my own life) “foreign” life streams, which for their part like my own have horizons of empathy that again I am able to get involved into in the mediacy of empathy and by actualizing the certainties of empathy, and thus *in infinitum*, and thus for the past as well as for the future.

Everything implied within my streaming awakened present forms a unity of potential and self-implied synthesis with it [with the present]. It is **a unitary synthetic horizon** like the synthetic special horizon of my immanent temporality within the abstractively singled out sphere of my “own” life in which I bring to re-intuition, that is to **re-actualization**, my concrete being past, the [past] of my life, through actualization of my implied past in recollections. The **total synthesis** combines my immanent life time with an open “infinity” of fellow subjects that are horizonlike known or unknown: in explicitly remembered empathy of certain for me co-present and co-past <subjects> <as well as> co-future and undetermined <subjects> in the way of open possibilities.

An **intersubjective present** as synthetic intersubjective simultaneity of life streams as streams of present, each of which is implied as a horizon in each other, and each of which implies its own past in that way that it implies it as a past of empathically implied simultaneous past of its fellow subjects in open infinity, [this intersubjective present] is thereby always constituted. Thus for the future. It lies within the community as **intercommunion** that my simultaneous we-all <is> implied in my present, and that this allness is one and the same and [that it is] discoverably the same for each subject of my We.

This **all-embracing synthesis**, the latent one and <that> of my flowing useful synthesis, “potentially” inhering in my flowing concrete present is in a flowing way constant synthesis of world perceptions, that is, a **unity of flowing world perception** itself, in which the world in its continuous being-sense as the world of us all, as the world becoming conscious to us all and being itself originally conscious world, is perceived. But of course this We-all does not only motivate the allness of the within the unity of **[91]** intersubjective present simultaneously connected ones, but by way of the constitution of immanent intersubjective temporality [it] also [motivates] the past simultaneity and the future, always horizonlike pre-meant <simultaneities>.

<§ 3. The modalizations of recollection and empathy belonging to the flowing world consciousness>

All this receives its correct sense only through thorough consideration for the **modalizations** <belonging> to the flowing present life, and emerging with the memories and empathy that respectively become current, and then to dive into the past itself , but never without any lasting performance.

Initially the **modalizations of recollection as such and of representing empathy as such** belonging to the synthesis of life streams and of each single life stream in its being self-contained come into consideration. It is not decided here what does sustain in the world as certain of being, and what possibly proves itself as that in a narrower sense, but what actually was existent as my own past being, especially as my own past life. Immanent recollections sometimes do not keep their certainty of being. Memory in the primitive mode has the certainty of past for me, namely the certainty of having perceived, i.e. [certainty] of having been conscious as original present of life. But this certainty can experience a modalization and result in cancellation. Yet the certainty that I was, that I had a past life is unbreakable; since if this itself was not a past, another one was which I need to find eventually by invading the latent horizon of memory. I also discover that the “evidence” of memory deception has its place exactly within the field of the self-memorial past, namely as becoming revealed antagonism of a partial memory (immanent memory), initially emerging in certainty together with other memories remaining steady in their certainty and going on proving themselves. That struggling with it shatters at the “secure”, [at the] “certain”. Of course **[92]** a clarification is needed as to why an unanimous past of one’s own must be able to be revealed since that what sustains, which in the acceptance of assurance is the same, could be modalized in a struggle with ever others, and so forth.

However, without solving this problem we accept that the unity of a past of one’s own consciousness life is unbreakable certainty while this past has the being-sense of [a past] that is to be deduced from self-memories. Thus the memorial life does in detail suffer modalizations , but it is still certain of its own past within each phase of life and from there [it is certain] of a horizon of the nearest future; and to this the potentiality belongs, to concretely exhibit <it>, what it actually was like, that is, to be able to even up the modalizations to a sustaining unanimity. But without an actual and even [without] a constant activity it so to say happens of its own accord that the unity of a pastness-horizon is always constituted with the sense of something unanimously being, something unanimously to be made, and that these occurring deceptions will be “excluded” in the form of current cancellation in the further course, and find a surrogate in what has been at its [?[[3]](#footnote-3)] place, that is, in constant self-amendment. Likewise for the horizon of future and with regard to the pre-expectation explicitly emerging therein.

At the same time we find something astonishing here: the modalizations are themselves occurrences belonging to the flowing life and as such enter memory. These memories could possibly be deceiving as well and what has just been said repeats itself for the modalizations and <for the> possible modalizations of the modalizations (that as modifications of certainties are something themselves and that exist in a certainty of a higher order). And yet everything fits into the unity of an immanent filled temporality by way of the referring amendment being a new present that yields itself and becomes a new past: but thereby, in the actualization of the past, extensions, crossings can emerge.

A **second sphere of modalizations** then is the one that does not concern the immanent being of empathy within the consciousness coherence, but its representing function, the certainty of being of the **foreign** represented therein. **[93]** Just as memory in the concrete coherence of the present of consciousness represents something not present in it, brings about a performance that transcends this present and that is modalizable as simple certainty of being, thus the **empathy** not only transcends the present of consciousness of me, of the one who carries the empathy within it [the present of consciousness], but together with the present of consciousness [it transcends] within it the whole future-like co-accepted as the respective whole past of the life and future of life.

It has to be heeded that when we speak of present of consciousness in this contrasting, we have already abstracted from the functioning of the acceptance that reaches into the past. In other words: We take the current recollections or pre- and co-memories emerging within the vitally flowing present of consciousness (and thus as a whole) as how they themselves are immanently conscious in original: as original Now. But this Now, called “recollection” for instance, is the medium of a second accepting, of a certainty of being that brings to bear that what is remembered within the Now-memory – and thus for the whole potentiality that presents as horizon consciousness a certain and explicit certainty of being that explicates the whole play of explicating recollections in advance and gives acceptance to the past of consciousness in one go. And similarly with regard to the future of consciousness. It is **exactly this** in the concrete vital present, in the totality of the explicit or implicit certainty of being in it, regarding my total conscientious life, that **transcends the empathy** belonging to the completely concrete vital present itself: on the one hand it is the content of my total life of consciousness, as currently present empathy belonging to the unity of my life, but <on the other hand> it [the empathy] completely goes beyond this life of mine within its transcending acceptance in respect of what is represented within it. It [the empathy] brings another Ego and another ego-consciousness and accordingly a second whole of life to immediate acceptance as currently direct empathy than what being implied within mine in another and yet essentially the same way within the concretion of my own being, like my past as acceptance of being and being-sense is implied in my current original present. **[94]**

<§ 4. The empathy horizon as horizon of acceptance>

It has to be taken into account now that in the whole horizon-like and explicable unity of my consciousness life again and again these and those empathic mental processes take place, and again and again (we initially ignore the exceptions of modalizations that have become necessary) and inevitably emerge as representations, as acceptances transcending the consciousness. This means: in the concretion of my vitally flowing present of consciousness <we> have within the horizon always and necessarily not only acceptances of recollections and memory in general, apart from the respectively emerging single current memories, but also an **empathy horizon** as horizon of acceptance.

In my vital conscious being is **always** also a foreign conscious being implied, a foreign ego, a foreign life, this has to be stressed again and again, within an analogous transcendence from implication like regarding the memory’s sphere of being that I now comprehensibly distinguish from the foreign [being]. But the foreign is also transcendently implied within my being: I am who I am, but being as an ego I carry others as being for me within me, and thus as inseparable from me, who I am. But as soon as the other <is> an accepted unity within me he is in this sense “another one” at the same time another ego implying in his sense mine [my ego]. Additionally we have to pay attention to the implied intersubjective relations: the other one carrying other ones within his horizon that I do not find immediately implied in my immediate empathy, but through the other one in mediate empathies. And thus eventually I have and we have an empathy horizon that mediately carries again empathy horizons itself in the way of an open-endless multiplicity of others of the others of others, and, what still had to be discussed, at the same time to be able to experience empathically within an open potentiality, *in indefinitum* others whom I actually do not have experienced.

Now we have considered the empathy, the experience of the *alter Ego*, of others as others purely as intentional implication of foreign life of consciousness (together with the ego immanent therein) within ourselves – **[95]** and thus mutually. Thereby we did not pay attention to what we have stressed in advance, that the vitally streaming consciousness is a **world consciousness**, even world perception. Does my life of consciousness, apart from its transcending in an empathic way, not constantly transcend itself under the title “”external” perception”, or, to avoid this dangerous expression, “perception of something spatiotemporally real, of something worldly”, and in an all-encompassing way under the title “world”? On the other hand, is not each empathy already a worldly one? What I bring to certainty of being as a foreign co-present life by transcending my life is not mere life of consciousness, but psychic life, psycho-physically experienced as animating a worldly body. And thus a man is there for me, and he is there for me as a component part of the spatial world and of a temporality that is spatiotemporality. That of course is correct. But the intentional analysis of the transcendent proper life in its self-transcendence performed as actual explication here brings about the relationships of founding of different transcending functions that constantly combined with others do function, for us, finding ourselves by way of bethinking as humans and as experiencing the world in advance. Transcendences are constantly combined with the transcendences of the representing functions through what we call “mundane perception”, but what for its part is only mundane perception in the complete sense when representing functions are con-awakened. But mundane perceptions (that is, taken as a whole with all these functions in their unity-performance) again experience a representation; and extraordinary difficulties have to be overcome in order to gain complete clarity in that way as the constant unity performance “world” transcendentally comes about, in which the consciousness itself, implying all transcendent performance, appears secularized with its ego that accomplishes all that, <like> the subjectivity itself performing the objectivation arrives in objectivating apperception at the apperceptive sense “human” (and “animal”), whereas currently performing subjectivity is always presupposed but remains hidden. **[96]**

Appendix VII

A fundamental part of the doctrine of the world experience’s horizon structure:

<intuitional core-sphere and external horizon with its standing-flowing near-and-far-structure>[[4]](#footnote-4)

*<Content:> Something fundamental concerning the doctrine of the horizon within simple world experience: core-stratification within the horizon. The iterative wakening in the course of experience (in continuous implication). Degree of vitality within the mediacy of this intermingling of awakening and limit zero as constantly flown through form.[[5]](#footnote-5)*

Let us now consider the essential structure of the world as far as it has a vital co-predelineated **external horizon** from the core-sphere of experience, from the field of perception. This results within the horizonedness of the respective experiential world itself in a proper “core”, the external horizon of which consists of a potentiality to be able to proceed from vital experiential surroundings to new experiential surroundings, from predelineation to new predelineation.[[6]](#footnote-6) It is difficult to articulate this clearly. There is an **iteration within the awakenings**, that is, [an iteration] of a mediacy of actual and possible awakenings that are implied in one another. The next and the following next [awakening] are in a degree of vitality, [a degree] of the current awakening. This has a limit, a zero, of awakening. Within the flowing experience this form remains, yet at the same time the respective degree of the awakening within a structural systematic changes. Experience “proceeding” thus that the next external horizon intentions (awakenings) are fulfilled, that new real things come into self-presenting appearance, at the same time a change occurs within the rest of the external horizon, in its “predelineation”. The predelineation, the differentiated awakening, has itself its “fulfillment”, namely in that sense, that what is farther away becomes the closer thing: The next mediate has become the immediate of the proper fulfillment, of the perception, the mediate of the mediate [has become] the next mediate, etc. There is always something most external, a zero, within this course. But what has just been the last mediate constantly receives anew within this change a new predelineation of a farther distance, which for its part predelineates the zero for it.

**[97]** But this structure predelineates itself continuously. – This means: We do not only have a flowing intentionality of closeness and distance with regard to the fulfillment as perception and to the secondary quasi-fulfillment of the non-perceptual approximation, but a co-streaming iteration and implication of awakenings of the most external horizon. The whole process in its structure of flowing is not only a flowing, but consciousness in predelineation of this flowing’s structure. Of course the constant certainty of this predelineation is itself an element of structure, but not ontic as certainty of being of the world perceptible therein, but certainty of being with regard to the immanent structure of the experiences flowing within the experiencing ego as subjective modes of the world’s givenness. This is thus a basic part of the intentional analysis of the external horizon, the demonstration of its flowing-standing close-distant-structure with the conclusion zero as standing form (most external horizon).

Within the intentional core of the flowing world perception we then have the intentional close-distant-structure.

At the same time [the following] is to be heeded concerning the method of the analysis:

1) The perceptual field in its flowing change is constantly awakening-predelineating at the same time and awakened, predelineated by earlier stages. From this [field] the horizon intention proceeds as rooted within it, but it is itself fulfillment of the antecedent horizon intention. Taken concretely it is a unitary process of apperception, a unitary apperception, a concretely unitary intentionality, comprising all partial intentionalities (or rather all partial apperceptions). We have in a standing-streaming way:

a) a **concrete unity of fulfilled intentionality** (in experience, self-presentation), of course relatively concrete;

b) as its essential correlate the standing-streaming **empty horizon**.

In a standing-streaming way we have divided the general form into these two supplementing forms, and each of them has its close-distant-structure.

2) But then we must not forget that we owe the knowledge of this structure to the primordial attitude and within it to the reflection and the reflective memory.

3) On the other hand noematic-ontic: The world consciousness as experiencing the world constantly perceives world concretely as a horizon, but the perceived world is world present of a world past and future, self-given with this sense of being. Accordingly “world horizon” means horizon of world present, having constantly predelineated and predelineating anew world present horizonlike within the flowing. Thus world present is constantly perceived in all-encompassing perceiving apperception – but world present of the world past, etc. The world apperception, self-giving as world in temporariness, and primarily as present, is also mediately “self-giving” as accepting past and future in an apperceptive way, and thereby again the identical time itself and the world itself, presenting themselves again as a unity within the flowing of the temporal modalities.

1. Possibly 1933 – Editor’s note [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Being implied obviously means: the world-consciousness does not have the character of original self-giving as pure, but as apperceiving <self-giving>. The unity of world-acceptance has components of acceptance. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Translator’s note: male or neuter pronoun in German, thus it can relate to the pastness-horizon, to the sense or the meaning [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. March 1933. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Belongs to March 1933, 8 page 1ff (= text no. 11). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Core-stratification within the horizon. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)