No. 19

My (our) world horizon in its spatio-temporality. <Spatiotemporal orientation: time modalities and spatial modalities>[[1]](#footnote-1)

Life proceeds as a process of **continuous world experience** – a continuous flowing of experiencing acceptance, an as a whole harmonious <process>, and as a whole a unity of harmony (also where single discordancies emerge, standing out from the unitary ground).[[2]](#footnote-2) That which we are certain of we can grasp explicitly, namely single actively performed certainties, consisting of acts of seeing by way of considering, [acts] of the feeling valuing being-occupied-with, or else acting. There are always acts, the Ego as awake [Ego] is always active; but there is also a constant **ground of certainty** – a perceptual field, surrounding world in general. Already when saying that, we have begun a first explication, well, a sense-investigation. I am occupied with this and that, for example, and I mention the whereby, and I point at the same time <to> and designate the closer and the farther horizon: world. To explicate horizons, ontically, noematically, noetically, the known and the unknown, the determinacy and the indeterminacy. The substrate and its determinations, known and unknown, that is, the on [τὸ ὦν] – the surroundings of onta, the world, the universe of the onta. Horizon – ontic horizon. The on [τὸ ὦν] appears within the subjective mode, as *cogitatum*, the way it is conscious. The world in an oriented way of givenness, the world as spatiotemporal world, as “standing” present, within the continuous flowing a present that in a flowing way “lets spring up, and carries” past and future, keeping a completed acquisition within its flowing, and designing a future horizon as streaming predelineation, vividly transforming into actualization under constantly new signs **[180]** and transformation.[[3]](#footnote-3) In this mode of **vivid time**, of time as streaming intermingling of temporal modalities, time presents itself as a form of the allness of the onta, as time of the world, as a **form of persisting being**, and of the persisting totality of the being **persisting itself**, as temporal locus, as time duration of the persisting being, as time-duration identically befitting the persisting being itself, ontic determination, property. The time of the world is the form of the “coexistence” – namely of the coexistence of something coexisting in the sense of the real, the true being of which (as something true ever again cognizable, verifiable as identically the same) has its what-content in having spatiotemporal determination. Each element of the what is identical determination of the identically being. Thus spatiotemporal determination is nothing that can change, but belonging to the real the way it is – eternal, timeless, if one understands by “temporality” the yielding flow of the **temporal modalities** “present”, etc. The spatiotemporal determinations, those belonging to all mundane <and> to the world itself, form an all-embracing unity or wholeness, that of the one spatio-temporality of the one world, which thus is the all-embracing form that comprises all special temporalities, and is at once the determination of the time which befits the world as totality. The time as all-embracing ont<ic> form, form of the real onta, is a “continuum” (not yet to be understood in a mathematic way) of temporal loci (points). Each concrete real in this continuum has a stretch, its finite extension, its finite special continuum, fitted into the whole continuum.

Time as form of real coexistences has **two main dimensions**: **succession** and **simultaneity**. It is coexistence of the succeeding, and in each phase of the succession [it is] coexistence of something simultaneous. The form of the simultaneous coexistence identically going through every succession is the **space continuum**. In this consideration of identity the **space** in its peculiar multi-dimensional structure is abstract-universal **form-determination of the world**. It is concrete as form of the world in its actuality in such a way that it has its temporal particularity as place within the universal succession, that simply is succession of spatiality, whereby the spatiality is contentually filled. As little as an empty **[181]** successive time does make sense, thus does an empty space. Spatio-temporality designates an abstract determination of form, a non-selfsufficient [determination of form] within the what of the world; and if “breaks” belong to the form of the world in its way of temporally filling through material content (“material” understood in correlation to this form), then these breaks (empty intervals and interim periods) are themselves real determinations within the whole of the world which alone is real as a whole, like also the single realities can only be within the whole – within the universality, which of course is a whole of a special sense.

Space and time thus belong to the ontic-real. **Time modalities**, those of the successive time, already belong to the “subjective”. <We find> a first subjective under the title “**temporal orientation**”.[[4]](#footnote-4) Likewise the simultaneous form of the time. The space has its **spatial modalities** or its “**spatial orientation**”[[5]](#footnote-5) – the here and there, like the now and earlier or later. But thereby soon the difference of the “subjective” comes into consideration as **my** subjective, or rather as the subjective of any other person, on the other hand the we-subjective. The world with all its ontic content is everyone’s world, but it is “**our**” world as well; and this “our” means: we, who are here together, or else: we from Freiburg, we Badener, we Germans, we Europeans, etc. And each we has its **we-orientation**, the here and there has its we-meaning. To this corresponds: I and everyone has his “position” within the spatio-temporality; and from his position he has his oriented world as surrounding world, and **each we** **has its we-position** – **its territory** – **and its surrounding world**, which is articulated in we-communities. Here is Germany – the country, the territory determines unitarily its spatial orientation unitarily for everyone in his we, [determines] unitarily the here, like the ground on which I am standing, and in its now, which is here and now, wherein I am bodily. The we has its **collective bodiliness**. But the here and now still needs some further explications.

Moving (or being moved) I am within different surroundings, I am within the near circle of <now> these things, now those things. **But always I am with my body**, governing within it and through it. It is **[182]** a proper field of the here and here, or here and there, a proper space, simply a proper shape which in itself is a system of places – like each thing, each the same in its movement and change, recognizable in its (although in the meantime changed, but yet to be identified) parts, members, is in identifiable and possibly recognizable, similarly articulated shape. And I can say, in spite of the movement and change: This member here, this place of the thing, this part, also this part changed in this or that way, and that [part]. Thus <as well> concerning the body: This finger here, <it> has an ink-stain at this point, or it hurts, etc., although bodily I am in motion in another sense here and there, and [although] the finger itself has its own relative movement and change of shape thereby. **That itself belongs to the building of orientation**. A thing within a rail car has during the journey, presenting itself relatively unchanged, its extension as persisting shape within this movement, and its “Here it is pointed, there it is rounded, here it is gray, there it is blue, etc.”

But now the essential difference of the successive temporality’s orientation in contrast to the simultaneous temporality, the spatial orientation.

The spatial orientation changes according to the single or the we-subjectivity, or rather, according to the unit of a common subjectivity. But each subject has with each subject, every common subjectivity [has] with any other [subjectivity] necessarily identically the same present in common, that is, identically the same successive-temporal orientation. As a whole they form a unitary co-existence, an open-infinite one, modalizing themselves into one with regard to the present, past and future. But the simultaneous co-existence in each present is related to the co-existing subjects in such a way that each has its orientation, its different [orientation].

The orientation of the spatiotemporality is a flowing change, in which the present of the world, past and future of the world is in constant acceptance for me in my flowing present. Within this flowing present becomes past for me, etc. And thus constantly a change of orientation takes place in which every mundane being keeps its place in the rigid form of the successive temporality, each as persisting for me in its change of orientation. Every Ego-subject co-present for me is for me **[183]** experienced or experienceable as Ego in its flowing present, in which the same present of the world, which is mine, is present for it, for this other subject, and is within my change of orientation, that, in rigid perfect likeness of form proceeding with mine, experienceably constitutes the same objective time for the other Ego and thus for us commonly. Thus all subjects being simultaneous with me and with each other are subjects of one and the same present of the world and successive-temporal orientation of the world. – For all of us existing now the successive-temporal orientation of the world (the temporally modal givenness of time) is the same. Since past is the same as past present, the all, present for me and for us, transfers itself to each past (and future) Ego-subject.

What about the form of simultaneity, the space and spatial modalities (spatial orientation)? Of course each subject being simultaneous with me necessarily has another spatial place; but this also in a necessarily different orientation. Identity of the spatial place and the space itself constitutes itself within the temporality of succession in the flowing change of orientation.

But however rigid the universal form of orientation remains as a form, in which the form of the world “space” with all emerging as spatial being therein is experienced for each subject, and experienceable respectively,– similar in this regard to the temporality of succession and the orientation of the time – it is still clear that the orientation of the spatial being within the single one and [within] the world in its universality can and does change within its rigid form, that is, for different subjects in a different way. This implies that the temporality of succession is rigid, that as analogon to movement , which has its possible correlate in rest, there is no change of place in it for the temporal being. Within the temporality of succession there is no movement of time, thus there is no rest. And in subjective regard also the orientation towards present, past, future is something remaining the same and for all subjects in rigid law, also deprived of all free choice. But within the space a change of orientation corresponds to the movement, being another one for each subject, and at the same time the freely acting change of place of the subjects being bodily within the world, and being able to move their respective body according to the free choice, does correspond to each change of place.

**[184]** But was it right to let the regressive inquiry proceed from the world towards the subjective, towards the world’s subjective modes of givenness, from general discussions concerning the temporality of the world and the spatiality of the world?

The world is a world of realities, persisting in motion and rest, in change of shape and unchange [of shape] (deformation), in “qualitative” change and unchange. Deriving from the world, the way it is given itself originally as a world of experience, the question what the world-experience does look like subjectively, which form it necessarily has to be able to experience world. Explanation of the world as world of experience . – What is the next there, the necessary first? The first is experience of single real things according to the overview over the set of types of the pregiven world as universe of single things. The first question <is the> [question] concerning the form of these real single things, and the form of their subjective multiplicities.

Anyway, one cannot remain within the abstract of the spatiotemporality, but has to start from the concrete world as world, as universe of concrete realities and their set of types, and to thoroughly consider the problem of the method of regressive inquiry as such.

Appendix XIII

<Induction within the world experience and the constitution of the oriented world of experience as world with earth and sky>[[6]](#footnote-6)

The presupposition of nature as definite multiplicity; each statement is justifiable, immediately or mediately. The deterministic opinion – the world is a definite multiplicity.[[7]](#footnote-7)

The anticipation (induction) and induceability, [both] lying within the apperceptive constitution of the world of experience, as method, to actually build in a core the anticipated possible experience in a verifying way – and prior to that to make intuited the anticipated, that is, to construct intuitionally possible experience as quasi-actual [experience], but then necessarily in undetermined generality as open range of possibilities, according to the typical apprehension lying within the apperception; furthermore facultative possibility of the construction of **[185]** the ontological form of the world as a form of its possible factual being thus, conversion of the universal type into an essential form and use of the conceptual form, to systemize the experienced in its undetermined horizonedness of the form, and to ever more perfectly determine it methodologically through observation and experiment – judicially, in an exact conceptual way. But there the continuation of the above said is missing. One can “observe” at a core, that of the direct experience, one can actually produce the immediately induced in a verifying way through proceeding “all-round” direct experience; or a negative verification (illusion) starts, mediated through modalization. The induction in the second sense then is directed towards the outside, according to the external horizon. An external anticipation is given with each perception. Accordingly: Each “observation” at a point, each exertion of all-round perception, that is, production of the perceptions immediately internally induced here, results, according to each nature, into an induction of nature towards the outside. “At the point” – this will say: within the however proceeding continuity of the perception (eye movement, etc., but also walking locomotion).

External inductions are accepted as being related to the intersubjective surrounding world in part through my own activity of approaching and correspondingly perceiving, and like all such verification (it proceeds in the continuity of the perception), it is set to yes and no; the intermediate possibility of the occurrence of modalities “between” being and not being lies on the way. In part the verification proceeds through the taking over of foreign experiences within the immediate connex or through communication within the documented expression. In a frame, the [frame] of the concrete present, the unchanged persisting being can possibly also be given in a verified way through approaching and direct perception of what has been expressed in a communicative way by earlier <men> , and has been cognized as expression in a persistent way. Induction of something past: immediately through one’s own memory. But the remembered cannot be observed all-round any more. Thus only the original immediate induction of the sides that earlier had remained unseen, in their relative determinacy, and [in their] otherwise undetermined universality, remains. Likewise by way of communication of others (who themselves are again induced other ones); here the open range of indeterminacy reaches even farther. Within each acceptance of being the evidence of the activity of the verifiability does lie constantly and necessarily as an inductive [verifiability] of yes and no, of being and not being, thereby likewise [the evidence of the activity] of the verifiability of the acceptance’s modalities.

By having a world I am the Ego of my factual ability to verify world induction, or rather, to be able to actively transfer induction – the induction belonging to and constituting the respective world experience - , in ever new shapes **[186]** in such a way that thereby partial verification continuously occurs through current perception, furthermore through current intentional modification of the perception as experiencing intuition. This [intuition] is only the core of the verification. Since correlatively we have the game of the inductions ever newly awakened along; and within this circle of the particularly remaining unfulfilled (temporally or permanently unfulfilled) secondary verification and infirmation themselves reign, insofar as the here and there originally awakened inductions fulfill themselves in their ways as express anticipations with a certain content (but without becoming intuitive) or do not fulfill <themselves>. Likewise: world experience is a total experience into which the respective horizon enters with the respective determined “predelineations” as outstanding and contentually relatively “distinct” sense contents, and beyond that <with> the still empty horizonedness. This in constant change. And only if the whole of all inductive signs, as external signs belonging to a respective experience, [if it] is the whole of the harmony, this experiencing intuition has its unbroken acceptance of being, or rather, it [then] ranks as a verifying [intuition]. But as to the total world experience, it is of a special structure. As totality it is in constant verification insofar as it carries the evidence that single indeterminacy is decidable and in such a way that the whole becomes totally harmonious.

How far does the verification through experience reach, how far does induction reach and as [an induction] that needs to be verified? For example, what about the **world** that needs to be assumed external of all human territories? What about the never to be entered depths of the earth? How does the being sense “earthly world” emerge through constitution as reaching beyond current and itself probable verifiability? What about the evidence of the respective induction? And if we gain motives of experience to construe the **celestial facts** as natural facts, is not the evidence here of the same kind?

The **earthly world**, of which we have been speaking up till now, at first is the surrounding world of my people in its territorial finiteness, yet surrounded by other peoples in the more primitive forms of human existence in open further extension on the same earthly natural ground. Nature as core here means **nature of the earth** as extending further within the directions of orientation in reiterationable continuation from the respective place on which one is standing earthly. This initially leads to the anticipation of the ground on which human life presents itself, as of an independent corporeality of an own kind “infinitely” proceeding ever further, simply in reiterationable experience. From it closed bodies can be divided as being experientially movable, and with the sense of **[187]** mobility and changeability, etc. But all closed bodies, bodies in the usual sense, belong to it [the corporeality]; they have above them their free, empty space belonging to it, into which each body could move like flying birds. **The nature of the earth has its natural space**; in addition it has its relief (mountains stretching upwards, etc.) And the air? At first it is not different from space. It is no body in the usual sense, nor earth in the usual sense on which the body could lie and thus belong to it, from which the body could detach, etc. The air is not the earth, it is not to be divided (spoken within the frame of experience) into actually (stiff) bodies. But it is everywhere where there is no body. But it still has its placelike and connective, however not sharply determined extensions as wind, as breeze, etc. It has similarity with the water, with the wide, endless sea one can bucket, and experience within a vessel as body – liquid body. But anyway, if the air is separated from the space, it is no more a body in the usual sense than the endless unitary earth surrounded by it everywhere and in the whole space, and fills it in its cavities.[[8]](#footnote-8) Together with the earth (with its firm and liquid parts) it belongs as one to the world that surrounds all bodies, all human beings and animals, and comprises all within. This world is spatial world; everything bodily-stiff, <everything> noticeable like the air in a special way, and of course <everything> liquid has its respective place and shape and in lasting or changing shape [everything has] mobility as well as other changeability.

But now the **sky and the celestial phenomena**. Is my try to assume for them (purely as objects of possible experience) a proper way of being not an exaggeration? The directions of orientation, or rather, the directions of moving bodies (like flying birds) that are imaginable from my respective standpoint, stretch, as soon as they leave the surface of the earth, upwards, towards the sky, and to each [direction]corresponds a place in the sky. Between earth and sky is an air-space, and the sky itself has a spatial shape of experience, that of a plane, - yet again not [the shape] of a plane like a body does have, nor [like] the special corporeality of the earth does have.

The **sky** is in no way seen bodily, and thus **the** **“between earth and sky”** is not an interspace, like one **[188]** between two things or like the cavity within a thing. On the other hand, like one thing covers another in a subjective way, and [like] an experienceable interspace belongs to the covering, thus each body in a suitable “position against the sky” covers a piece of the sky’s expanse. Underneath it [underneath the sky’s expanse] there is space as airspace, and as space allowing movement, but it itself is neither spatial nor bodily, not spatial, namely not a plane within the space – purely spoken from experience. As to the **sun** and the **moon**, they as well are not earnestly apperceived as bodies. They belong to the sky, they are not seen as bodily spheres or disks. The man knows high mountains, [he] knows their perspectively diminished appearance from afar. If this determined the apperception of sun and moon, men would imagine them as bodies of a quite excessive size. But is this what they are doing actually? We do not have a simple original apperception from afar in this case. Things within the distancing-from-us (like the rail car subjectively) are constantly <given> in apperceptions from afar, constant appearances from afar from the familiar near [thing] (and relative to each other in constant intentional modification of the from … from … from …). When they become indistinct at the horizon’s circle, shrinked as distant limes into a “point”, then this limes is not an apperception from afar, not a distant appearance of the familiar near [thing] any more, but simply just as zero of the decrease of change; <it is>as little a distant thing as the quiet – that which destroys the sound – is still a sound. Only in the transition towards the limes does the limes receive its intentional sense as limes of the distance (which one may not confuse with the interval emerging in the distance within the space).

How come then that we apperceive the moon as a far away firm sphere or disk, as a distant body? Everything earthly distant for us is in front of the sky, and the earth’s circle of the horizon (for example on the sea) is still not at the sky. In between there are the playing clouds that so often cover the sky. The clouds are always in front of the sun, in front of the moon. The experience leads us to view the sky as spherelike plane on which the moon and the other planets move and the fixed stars have a firm locality. But apart from that the sky remains sky; and to grasp the stars as bodies of the most distant distance, that is a special imposition, even more than the sun and the moon.

Now these facts of the sky at first present a **proper sphere of facts**, purely from their experience and constant verification of the experience, in their “being” a sphere of facts, i.e. verifying as being actualities of **their** sphere, and possibly infirming in detail as illusion. But just in detail. Since taken totally the being constantly belongs to the sphere of the sky, and in constantly verified certainty [it belongs] to the world phenomenon. **The experiential world is always already** **[189] constituted as earthly world** having bodies as being in the way of the distant-near-verification within its universal phenomenon, **and as sky-world** having its own universal phenomena (sky by day and by night, etc.), and its own single beings.

Then the expansion of this incorporeal sphere of being into distant appearances of bodies, in which thus bodies are experienced, which as being for us, the subjects of the original surrounding world, then necessarily are bodies within the one single space. The world with the duality of beings becomes a bodily world with animalia belonging to it as inanimated bodies. With proceeding experience: The moon covers the stars in its movement, possibly it is also observed that planets and comets cover fixed stars.

But eventually, is the apperception of the celestial bodies from afar, as not to be tracked back to a near experience, something different than the inaccessible parts of the earth between the territories inhabited by men? That is, in how far do transcendentally constitutive differences exist here?

1. Possibly beginning of 1932. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Is a perceptual field, a current concrete present able to show itself in the form of the illusion? Can it be modalized as a whole? [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Real time in temporal modality. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Temporal orientation = time modality. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Spatial orientation = spatial modality. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Presumably 1934. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Of substances! [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. It is still a task to show how the apperception of the earth as body like other bodies which we only cannot overview as a whole (like mountains already), comes into existence. Even then there remained the question when within the proceeding of the experience one would be capable to cognize the all-round tracing back of all earthly ways to the origin. But does not the apperception of the flying of birds and the objectivation of the possibility to be able to fly higher and higher suffice for that? [↑](#footnote-ref-8)