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<Constitution of a common world in a community of normal and abnormal men. Different types of abnormality>[[1]](#footnote-1)

If I perform phenomenological reduction I grasp my absolute being; the pregiven world becomes a phenomenon and mine and my fellow men’s worldly being gains the absolute sense of transcendental or absolute being, our conscious life [gains] the absolute sense as transcendental life, wherein the world for me and of the others being absolute for me constitutes itself, constitutes itself intersubjectively in transcendental communalizing.

Within the world I find my “fellow men” – thereby I am at first thinking of **normal** ones. And the community is a normal one. I find there already different **forms or levels of normality** and correlatively the world phenomenon constituting itself within the normality. Or else: While explicating the world pregiven to me, the first I say to me is: I always have already a supposed and thereby in certain limits experienced, in its selfness given world showing itself. If I stick to the experience, then indeed I always have already a world within experience, that is it itself, but [I always have] the difference between that which is experienced (known) and a horizon of the not experienced (unknown), of the not just now momentarily not experienced, but unknown in general. Furthermore distinguished there: <horizon> of the anticipated in a relative determined way, of the predelineated (indicated), and of the completely undetermined – up to the determinateness of a closer to be determined complete shape with special shapes (that of spatio-temporality and of the shape belonging to its filling).

To bring the world to self-givenness, to enter from proper world experiencing into the horizon, to uncover the experiencing consciousness and the transcendental performance within the correlative research, through which the gradual world comes to acceptance and to the ability to be shown, this shall be the task. But there I arrive at **[669]** the levels of surrounding worlds and their syntheses and at the corresponding constituting subjectivity. But I do not simply have surrounding world in its levels and immediately belonging to it the subjectivities of the modes of the surrounding world, but from scratch I have the **intersubjectivity** being constituted and I already have to pay attention to the **differences of normality and abnormality** in this constitution as being determinant for the constitution and its relativity. The corresponding levels need to be searched for systematically.

The world of experience is for me and for us – or rather, <for> the others being with me, who in the first instance are an open multiplicity of my kind in a first normality – world of actual and possible experience. But how far does this possible experience reach, properly speaking? This has the meaning: How far does my own (primordially reduced) experience as experience of the world reach, which in all modes of time is my actual and my possible [world]? The possibility thereby is a (but not mere) change of essence of the actual [experience of the world], like a possible experiential thing of my world horizon is a change of the actual one. If I then take the empathy with me, then this is a new kind, a mediate one, of representation, but the represented foreign actual and possible experience is itself only of the same essential shape like mine.

Within this transcendental (as well as psychological) connection of men as <those> of my “normal” We I have and everyone <has> an essential identical “image of perception”[[2]](#footnote-2) of the world, a memorial picture[[3]](#footnote-3), and everyone[[4]](#footnote-4) can in the taking over of the properly experienced and experienceable objectivities of his fellow men construct a universal, endlessly open “idea of the world”, a synthetically endless picture of the world, that of a world of experience in endlessly proceeding intuition – of a normal intuition.

**[670]** Within the uncovering of the constitution continuously “inner”, immanent experience is exerted, simple “reflection”; it is this as transcendentally-subjective noetic experience which alone plays its role as actual and possible [experience] and in different levels of modification falling under the universal concept of the pure reflection.

As soon as we take into account that there are **abnormal men** within the world, we see that we do not get along with possible experiences of the former kind for the constitution of its “inwardness”, and that we have the **new problem of the transcendental interpretation**, that is, differently for the different abnormalities. Newborn child – at the same time as a proper level of the past, which still cannot be a memory past in the experiential sense; because within normality experience is actual and possible space-worldly experience. Thus memory as experience leads to a past world. Within normal constitution at the same time always the world horizon already belongs to the experienced, and also the constituting experiences, objectivated as human experiences range themselves into it, like I and we always have a self-consciousness as human itself being-within-the spatio-temporal-field.[[5]](#footnote-5) Other types of abnormality: Madness, febrile delirium – forms of illness, in which the normal conscious life does not remain normal life of world consciousness, but [in which] the world formerly pregiven in a normal way suffers destruction. But possibly and as an especially important marginal form: the inherent madness and its “world”. Also faint and especially sleep without dreams as belonging to the existence of normal men themselves, as abnormalities immanent to their life do belong here, insofar as these stretches of internality do not have any constituting function on the first level. Similar is the case with the animality in its manifold levels. Eventually the issue of the primitive man.

On the first level of the constitutive explication of the normal world in normal intersubjectivity I have, through immediate “inner experience” an access to my primordial constituting life, **[671]** through empathy as changed inner experience [I have] access to the actual and possible <experiencing> of “normally rational” fellow men, whereby within their essence their experiencing and their experiences join each other as like to like, and create a synthetic unity. That is exactly why I can “take over” <their experiences>, and with the help of everyone’s experiences, the possibility of which I can immediately create, [I can] bring the infinity of the world as normal world to my intuition in such a unitary way, as if I were an endless Ego, and [as if] I were myself present in the infinity of the world.

If I transgress this level, I do not remain in the same community of essence, and still I have in another sense others – I say for example “still human, but human babies”, “still men, but mad men”, “febrile ones”, “sleeping ones”, etc.; they are men, they are kinds of consciousness, **intentional changes of** **normal men**, to be interpreted transcendentally, absolute subjects of an absolute life, which, as such a life, still has a more universal community of essence with ours, and still not that one, which has an essence of normal rational men, our, the normal ones’, experiencing world-life, founded through experience, whereby world simply is the normal one – the true one. The true [world], but it still includes all those abnormal psychic beings, and if these were actually experienceable the way they are in truth (experienceable by us fellow men in the normal sense, in the sense that empathy in normal fellow men makes perceivable), then also their psychic life and the world being accepted therein was likewise experienced as well – experienced as normal. This certainly is stated in an unclear way.

Do we not have to say <the following>? It is implied in the horizonedness of our, of the normal experienceable world, of the pregiven one, that it has a realm, a universal structure of the “actually and properly”, of the normally experienceable, of the intuitional and of what is to be made intuitional, and eventually to be verified in this intuitability, in the sense that it is actually experienceable in the mode of self-givenness, of the presenting itself and ability to present itself to me the way it is (scil. in relativity). But within the horizon there is also predelineated a realm of psychic subjects, being only experienceable in the secondary form of variants of men like me, of normal ones, that is, in experiences **[672]** which are variants of our actual, for us self-giving [experiences]: indirect original experiences. Thereby these variant forms of men are subjects of world phenomena. Their experiencing life, their conscious life as such, is not accessible for us through any original empathy, but only understandable, experienceable on a mediate level, through an intentional modification of simple empathy.

1. Probably 1930 or 1931. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “Image of perception” certainly is a dangerous expression. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Likewise. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. „Everyone“ does again not mean „all men“. –Each closed life community has its normality and the “everyone” has its special sense for it; and thus the surrounding world, that which everyone experiences as world, is not the idea of the world being in itself the same of all men in unconditioned universality. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. From „in the taking over“ to „being-within-the spatio-temporal-field.” two wavy lines in the margin drawn with a pencil. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)