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Pre-givenness and horizon.

<Horizonal pre-givenness of pre-given real things. Different modes of foreground and background. Milieu of the unconscious. Inner horizon and outer horizon>[[1]](#footnote-1)

The direction towards the corporeal in its extensional determinations is preferred in thematizing **any** real thing. Man for example is originally experienced by way of apperceiving the human body’s type of organic corporeality; even though <it is> not constantly explicated, it needs to be recognized as a human body in its physical type for the man to be cognized as a man. This is certainly understandable. There is initially not a mere body for me, perceptually as something real by itself, but the real “human” is pre-given within the pre-given field. The advertence goes over into explication: In the course of apprehending the corporeal, and in detail within the elements “expressing” something psychic, the person is explicitly experienced as the one owning and governing this corporeal body. But thus the real “human” is experienced, i.e. explicitly experienced. This means: What is apperceived within the course, and merely as a bridge to what currently is of proper interest, the thematic, is co-accepted with the personal which comes to thematic special apprehension as animating. Or: If there is a human in my field of perception, and if I put my eye on him, then he is grasped in his general type, in the regional <type> “a man” with the help of a grasping ray as something real pertaining to this field. Now the real of this region has its mode, peculiar to its essence, of unfolding itself within its being, of explicitly showing its elements of being thus, its determinations. Namely: **The self-presentation of corporeality is founding**. It is founding for the self-presentation of the egoical. What does this founding signify?

**[100]** Initially the concrete real is **merely and straightforwardly self-given**, due to the affection grasped in a grasping ray, that is, already [grasped] as what it is, but in such a way, that its whatnesses, its sense of being which is a manifold and systematically built sense of being, is still swathed, unevolved (implicit) (sense of being). This “implicit” mode of givenness is just a general mode in all experience.

While[[2]](#footnote-2) the real thing is an object “**of the background**” it is already accepted that it is conscious in a mode of self-presentation that has an implicit sense-structure. This is what reflection teaches us, that is, as a result of active experience. Looking back we grasp the background at the real thing itself with which we are actively occupied, we grasp the use of occupation when looking back, [we grasp] the preceding affection that is followed by advertence, and from there [we grasp] the transition into explication. As to the affection, we see that it is also (like the incipient advertence) has one ray, whereas of course the background real is not explicated. But it has implications, it has an implicit sense-structure. This is exactly what we say in the making identical of the real thing being explicated and the same that had already been conscious as real thing of the background, and that affected, and that [has been conscious] as the same, i.e. <as> the one, the sense of which just explicates itself or has explicated itself in its separate-isnesses, in its determinations.

Thus we distinguish the background mode before the affection and within the affection, changing itself into the active mode of the foreground object before the explication, and then emerging in the process of just this, the unfolding of the isnesses, by which the sense of being shows itself. But this explication is “sensefully” organized; the explicates are not heaps, but the sense as determination can respectively only emerge as a determination within an order, insofar as already explicated sense is the presupposition to enable the emergence of a new sense, and this because the former sense also makes part of the later sense, [because] this [sense] presupposes that one as a sense, as something meant.

To this and to all modes of givenness modes of the certainty of being, of the acceptance of being do belong; they are themselves nothing else but **[101] acceptances of being of the respective sense-content**. Whether the real objects are conscious as foreground or as background – they exist for us, that is, they are “there” for us, “present” in a conspicuous sense, originally perceived within a “perceptual sense” as they themselves. Similarly in the case of a recollection that at the same time emerges and comes to intuition regarding the field of recollection. Obviously this relates to new modes of acceptance of being and of the mode of givenness of real things as such. We then have new modes of the backgrounds. The whole perceptual field can be a background if we devote ourselves to an affection of memory, whereby within the memorial field, that as a whole has a certain foregroundedness, a mode of pre-acceptance, the specially affecting, the primarily (and secondarily) grasped are distinguished from the memorial background. Conversely, though memory can still hover and “hover away”, the perceptual field can have the precedence.

Eventually a completely different, never failing background is of some importance, that essentially differs from everything that has been called foreground and background up till now, lying “behind” all that. Namely the former lies within the frame of the concept of consciousness in the conspicuous sense (within which the most special, preferred one <is> the [sense] of the common speech: the active consciousness, that of the modes of attention, of the being-directed-towards-something in general). The respective “unconscious” forms the contrast.[[3]](#footnote-3) But this is also the “dark”, not intuitable horizon of co-accepted real things in the modes of acceptance of the memorial intentionality with the ont<ic> sense-form of real spatio-temporality, in an intentional intermingling, presenting a mutual externality, a mutual externality of potential intuitional fields with the corresponding potential backgrounds and foregrounds, as they have been described above, - and this whole continuity as a **realm of possible awakening, of possible affection**, and in effectuation of the affection leading to reactivation as becoming-intuitive-again, as intuitive “memory”.

**[102]** It is obvious that here as well only from the experiential field of the actually experiencing intuition, and from the affection of the not intuitable object of the “background” intuitively emerging at the same time, a mental return to the for me constant being of the horizon sphere is possible, which gives sense to the being that is unconscious to me, that is not in an intuitable way valid for me. The awakened, that which emerges not intuitably from the dark is as that self a mode of the givenness; this “not intuitable” is itself intuitional as something emerging, a facultative possibility belongs to it to bring to an intuitive “fulfillment” the not intuitable intention (intuitive as immanent mental process) in that direction, but also its possibility to arrive at intuitability. This is a change of the mode of givenness under the synthesis of identification (union). But going back one has to say that already prior to the awakening the sense-being of what is present (first of all of the perceptional field and of the intuitional field as such) has an acceptance of being which already meant along the horizon and what has singly emerged as being. Within the revelation of the horizon it becomes apparent what has been valid before, and the continuity of the acceptance reaching farther, of the farther reaching total sense of what intuitively, and then already in detail awakened empty has and did come “to the fore”.

But the **horizonedness** – the milieu of the unconsciousness, surrounding the respectively specific conscious, or the horizon of the latent, unconscious, and yet co-accepted sense, belonging to the patent, intuitionally filled sense, that is, as co-determining the sense of the patently objective – is a **double** one:

On the one hand it concerns the substrate structure of the real things that intuitively present themselves, insofar as they have their current and potential horizon of explication of which only a part is respectively presented in an intuitive way.[[4]](#footnote-4)

But we notice that this still needs to be differentiated. We have the difference of the explicitly and implicitly intuitive in the sense of the **actually and properly intuitive** in the subjective temporality at each intuitive givenness of a real thing. Each intuitional thing can explicate in its temporal intuition **[103]** (and in each phase of this temporality) into such explicates that are intuitive themselves. The not explicated being-sense in this regard explicates itself into its properly intuitive determination-content. In the synthetic course of explication the consequence of the intuitive explicates shows itself as an intuitive unity; the determining elements form a **whole** which is intuitive as a whole, and [which] does not become unitary through gradual combination. Already prior to the explication there is a unitary content of proper intuition within the intuitively conscious real thing, making up the whole of what actually presents itself of the object – the **properly appearing part**, the “intuitional image”, the proper perception.

Still **another explication** is always possible, namely exactly the **horizonal**. The not explicated intuitively given means manifold things as having become present that can be interpreted within the evidence of “clarification” as meant within this presentation; but necessarily among these there is also such a thing being a **not intuitive element of determination**. Thus with all real things. I have an implicit and to be explicated sense within its original self-giving, within its experience, reaching farther than what is given and to be given as intuitive being-thus within the explication. But this “**inner” horizon**, the determination horizon of the real thing as substrate of explicable determinations, can be freed from its absence of intuitability; i.e., as we can say, the subjective mode of givenness of this real thing as properly perceptive self-presentation from this side <has a> horizon of possible and facultatively possible modes of appearances, namely of those that within the respective and possibly to be directed course from the experience into a continuity of ever new experiences would become intuitive in these [experiences] as elements of being thus, and that could thereby be posited through active explication. Each experience “points to” a multiplicity, that is, as systematically unitary continuity of to be formed experiences that takes on the character of a continually higher level experience within its synthesis. In this [experience] the identical substrate is slowly analyzed in its sense determinations. But to each extent, to each part of this synthetic experience the same substrate does correspond in the sense determinations that become intuitive within it, and with a horizon of attendant meaning, **[104]** that has to be clarified within the evidence, and that by way of clarification only yields the not intuitional meaning of being thus. The intuition only emerges through the transgressing of the respective experience, through its conversion into the universally proceeding experience of the self. The inner horizons thus concern the concrete objects in their substrate structure; they are the horizons of explications, of the being thus.[[5]](#footnote-5)

<On the other hand:> The concrete objects lie within **outer horizons**, in their intuitional fields that do have themselves **sense determinations “from outside”** within their being sense (apart from the inner horizons of their singly intuitive objects). Additionally to all that awakenings and modes of aliveness. After all, each awakened is an awakened substrate, and has its inner and outer horizon, etc. from there.

What has been exhibited there is obviously a **fundamental part of the doctrine of the world’s pre-givenness** – of the real [world], and then in general of a pre-given world in general (thus also idealities taken along). Of course this is just a beginning. – The consideration for the structure of modalization and [of the] correction is missing. Also the consideration for the world’s constitution in regard to the modes of inter-subjectivity is missing, [in regard] to the relative, finite humanities, and then nexus between humanities that are foreign in relation to one another, and have pregiven correlatively mutual foreign worlds, and yet within the connection with the foreign ones [they] are certain of the world which is accepted by one with that sense, by the other with another sense. But this **single** world is not properly pregiven.
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