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More on the constitution of the build-up of the world: <The constitutional effect of history and natural history for the extension of the being-sense of the generatively constituted world. The question concerning the constitutive co-functioning of the animals>[[1]](#footnote-1)

*<Content:> The generatively constituted world of possible proper experienceability in its enlargement, gradually towards the complete earthly, properly exerienceable world of humanity (lifeworld)as foundation for the natural historical and exact-scientific extensions to the whole world (of geology, paleontology, etc. <and of> physics>. Finally: the analogizing apperception, with the help of which this highest extension comes to pass in parallelization or identification with the empathizing appresentation.*

The abstractive decosntruction of the world in layers as world of actual and possible experience exclusively teaches to understand the constitutive structure of the generatively constituted world as being constituted in proper experience. But this does not yet constitute the whole sense, which the world has for us; whereas one will say now that this whole sense historically accrued to the science of our generative inter-subjectivity just by way of philosophy. But how is this to be explicated now? Which are the highest levels of the whole constitutive sense of the world?

This at the same time results in an awkward problem here. Are there any possibilities for the further constitution of our world and thereby for its being sense still open? Does the constitutive style, in which the world gains a sense for us, imply an essential structure of possible reiterable enlargement which is not only directed to the enlargement of the object’s horizon and the property’s horizon, or rather, of the law’s horizon of the world being for us in invariant form? Is the possibility open as well, and due to essential reasons, that this **invariant form** relativizes itself?

**[538]** We have with each constitutive level an invariance of form constituted for it. This is not by any chance lost on the higher level, like the “objects” constituted on the respective level are not lost by becoming founding elements, that is, through an “apprehension” [becoming] “appearances-of”, namely [an appearance] of the objects on the higher level. The objects relativize themselves and the world’s forms, of course correlatively [they] also [relativize] the constitutive forms which are already habitually built (acquired by the single subjects), or rather, [which are] to be build (to be acquired). If transcendental subjectivity (transcendentally understood humanity) is within a continuous constitutive developmental process, <then> **the universal and deepest form of its historicity** is the following: to be forced to constitute “the” world being for this humanity within oneself in a procession from level to level in such a way that the **being, the world itself is developing** according to its ont<ological> being sense, according to its respective universal form, to its universal Apriori.[[2]](#footnote-2)

We have the generative world, our cultural world; it enlarges to a generative world encompassing Europe and Asia, eventually the earthly human peoples, the histories of which combine to a new history.[[3]](#footnote-3) Goal: Europe and the old Mexicans. We may count all that as enlargement of a generatively constituted world again to a unity of a generatively constituted [world]. Has <anything> essentially changed within the invariant structure of this world due to these enlargements? The first step – we will call it: the [step] from Europe to China – does indeed convey something new however: The beginning is the incomprehensibility of the Chinese cultural world (that of their higher humanity, of their historical individuality) for Europe and vice versa.

The disclosure of one’s own generative tradition as performance of “**history**” already means a new kind of enlargement of the being sense of the world for our humanity. Our humanity gets to know itself as a personal unity within the unity of its life, [it] concretely learns to understand this, its “historical”, generative individuality, **[539]** learns to judge itself from history, similar to a single man who gets to know his individual being by way of the memory survey of his life, and learns to judge it. Humanity concretely learns to understand what it is aiming at in its generative existence; it singles out intuitionally a genuine telos lying within one’s ability, which, being formed in a sense-investigative way, could be actualized in a rational volitional resolve (by arbitrarily to be created organizational events) as the volitional goal of humanity being a connected unity, a volitional unity. Thereby humanity and the single man as its functioning member are bestowed with a new, a higher sense, and thereby the world [is bestowed with a new sense] as being a cultural world for him, from him. **History** thus is not a random part of the cultural world, but it is **a constitutive performance accruing from humanity**, putting into operation and enabling that constitution, which creates a new world, **a world of a higher sense** out of the pre-historical world (prior to the establishing of a however developed history). But this may have been stated in a too universal and constructive way and is in need of some considerations.

*Ad notam*. In such a history with regard to the historical time it is like within memory of a single man with regard to his time and [to] the time of the individual world taken for him abstractively by itself. If the world spatio-temporally is just a generative one, and if, being itself already undisclosed, [it is] historically constituted, then time without “birth” (= beginning of the generation) and without death (of the generation) is openly beginningless and endless.

One may probably say now: The temporality of the world for the man living within his generative connection, that of **his** cultural humanity, is a **generative close-worldly temporality** prior to undisclosing history (“science”). The world simply **also** **temporally** distinguishes between near world and distant world. “Scientific” history enlarges the near time, and creates an endlessly open, but historically undisclosed <and undisclosing itself> past temporality, and from there[it creates] a generative future horizon with predelineation, or rather: <a> near temporal world, <a> whole generative temporal world, contentually related to **this** generative humanity, also of course with regard to the spatial givennesses and to the spatiality itself as form and to the **[540]** concrete culture with nature. To the concrete vivid present of the single subject and to the present belonging to the surrounding world **the vivid present of the generative humanity and its worldly present** do correspond – present in a wide sense of the word. To the life-time of the single subject as its universal time of memory, purely undiscovered from the inside, corresponds the **whole time**, undisclosed for the generative humanity through history, namely **“life time”**, being **purely constituted** for it (for humanity) in a generative way, or rather world time and world itself.

The man who has acquired a knowledge of history says: Humanity did not know anything of the world’s temporality, did not know anything of its past yet, <did not know anything yet> of the distant time. Since now actually the unhistorical man will from his fathers and grandfathers already have a consciousness in a reiterational way of an unknown line of generations and thereby [he] already has past time as a time being empty for him, receiving its imprints through history. Is thus something essentially new performed with regard to the structure of sense of the world? Has not the already constituted temporal form, the endless open one, just been determined contentually? And the question repeats itself as soon as we as Europeans discover East-Asia, etc., and [as soon as] the one humanity gets an inner, historical access to the other [humanity], so that special generative life-unities, personal unities, combine to one.

But if we then pass over to the **natural-historical enlargement of the world**, always already being constituted in a generative way? The generatively constituted world, purely as such, prior to astronomy, to geology, paleontology, then connected to exact physics in the widest sense, is open; but however far it enlarges itself, and conceives of itself as being enlarged in its style, it is a human life-world.

We have to consider now, what this means and how far this does not convey too little. Since, how about the **animals** and their life-worlds? Are they not also to be considered in a **human** way?[[4]](#footnote-4) Namely, there is the endless aerial realm of the birds, there is the “endless” sea with its fishes, its whales, etc. May thus “life-world” designate a world of physical things, within which there are men everywhere, or to which men could come everywhere? A world of possible experience as human experience, optically perspectivating itself, and perspectivation transferable to near-physicalness, which then at the same time becomes bodily graspable and immediately practical. One could say: Man is able to swim; however, when diving, he is unable to see anything, he cannot be an aquatic animal. But **understanding the animals as human modifications, he amplifies the scope of his possible experience by theirs**.

But against this it will be brought out: The endless mainland has its depths as well, it “consists” of stones, and thus water [consists] in its depths of water. The sense-fashioning suffices here, which as such leads from the things of the surface by way of division again to things of the surface, and respectively from the solid style of experience to the constitution of whole bodies, the inner spatio-material being according to the ideally extensional divisibility is built up of many planes, which become visible only through current division. Apart from that, with regard to the accessibility through current experience we have a certain openness towards the earth and the sea, but [we do have] restraints of the ability which initially become conscious as being de facto empirically. As to the air, a special problem is how it constitutes itself as bodily reality since it cannot constitute itself originally in an optical way, and thus the being-within-the space not only of different kinds of air, but also of radiating material, of invisible “small” corpuscles, etc.

1. Probably also September 1931. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The world itself has its world history. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Our concrete surrounding world, the world of our generative humanity: earthly unity of a history as closed result of the enlargements. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Question as to the constitutive co-functioning of the animals. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)