No. 50

<Time of the life-world: vivid world-present with effective world-past, and [world]-future, vivid special present and [special] future. Different common horizons – different common presents. The most external world-horizon and its all-human correlate>[[1]](#footnote-1)

We always already have world as subjective “idea of the world”, a universe of acceptance of being with a sense content, that is, an intuitional world within the horizon of possible intuition, so that possible intuition is ever again intuitional world with a horizon – unitary, finite, closed intuitional world. Field of perception and in extension ever again unity of an intuitional world-finiteness within the horizon.

What does the unity do, the most narrow one as well as the extended? Not that what I actually see, like the room from its front side, while I am calmly sitting there. Rather the room in its all-roundness, then the extension the way it is indicated in advance as real possibility. I have as a core the “primordial” world which, while being awake, needs to be gained from the actually proceeding sphere of perception by continuously perceiving in the most original factual possibility. A world-appearance is finite, since I eventually cannot [go] any further and have to cancel it. We have there the complete kinesthetic near senses and distant senses, normal human ones: the unity of the visual field of perception, the unity of the tactile perception, both related to each other, and unitarily referring to each other. Field of perception: all-roundedness of the actualization of the visual kinesthetics and formation of the visually intuitional endless “world” – visual “picture of the world”. The oculomotor kinesthetics belong to the visual kinesthetics, but also the other bodily kinesthetics <belong> [to it] as functioning for the vision in a certain way. On the other hand the tactually perceived, formed within further touching. Common on both sides: something formal.

**[572]** Each momentarily given thing in itself refers to a de facto possible formation within its inner contentual differences. On the other hand the total visual kinesthetics and total tactile kinesthetics, in order to realize not just the inner, but also the external inductions. Within the continuity of the realization the guidance from intention to all-roundedness, and how within continuous further perception as such a synthesis results in a unitary “picture”. The enlargement results in the intuitional surrounding world – insofar as it can be made possible within the enlargement at all. The rest is vague objectivation of further continuation – like if it was possible, possibly with intermediate intuitions (a proper analysis). Additionally the synthesis of the inter-subjectivity, in which subjects are objectivated and accepted as subjects of their primordial world-objectivations, etc. Now, each fellow subject, represented by the apperceived in horizonedness through primordial current experience (perception), whose being sense has the indicated stratification, still needs to be characterized more closely for me as potentiality of a current unitary formation in motions according to what we have discussed.

That which presents itself within this motion as intentional unitary formation within the openness proper to it, [within] endless determinability, is world pure and simple, the now existing [world], my universal **world-present** within the flowing perception as universal perceptual sense, but thereby with the activities of not merely passive experience, of the merely passive processes of “complete pictures”, as those in which unity is pre-given in a passive way, but rather we grasp, we relate, we go back to what we have previously said, we have purposes and [we] act, etc. The world, the now current [world], thus has the character of the already known or becoming known or to be known things which have and get the sense of values, of formations for a purpose, of useful [things] for us, for me respectively, or else useful for others, for all, as cultural objects, etc., in “our” active life as [a] valuing [life] reshaping by way of acting.

This world as being present implies at the same time its immanent past and future – that which is currently available to me and my present comrades, and as that [is] horizon of possible disposition. In the widest sense of disposition also the **[573]** critique does belong here, which I offer regarding past illusions, also [regarding] my past illusions concerning value and will (purposes), I could say: [regarding] my acceptances of value and will, the way they are now all at once accepted by me in cancellation.

What is the widest horizon there for me? – My past life of acceptance and my past primordial world and world as such, the way it is accepted by me in this life. But again acceptances therein. For instance, I had chosen this profession for life, but later I changed. For example, I had started as a merchant, and then I became a scientist, I had started within some crafts, and then I became a factory worker, I then launched a factory and became a big industrialist. This determines <the> current horizon within my life which is divided into periods accordingly. I have respective prevalent interests and a continued horizon of interests, which as the [horizon] of the respective profession is a continuous unitary horizon of actuality; and this determines the present world in which I currently live as subject with interests, with regard to the current past belonging to it, - currently for me. Yet again the special interest currently leading me is determining, e.g. as a merchant a process which is widely expecting, absorbing me completely: this occupies me “in the present”, I have to take into account the parts of that which has already been introduced and actualized, that is, a corresponding past being vivid special past; and likewise vivid future is that which this interest and its future “possibilities” give reason to expect.

But within my life, apart from my profession with its professional interests, professional goals, professional worries, plans, actions, I have my family interests as father of my children, whom I “need to educate”, as citizen of my home country, for which I perhaps have to give my life, etc. Being focused on my existence as citizen of the state I have another present. Now it is the present of the world, the [present] of my state’s nation, and mine as being ranged in it; and the world-past of this nation is that of its history, the way it is currently history within it, not the way the historian presents it, one [historian] thus, the other one otherwise.

Communality of the existence for me is in question in different ways, and according to my focusing on this or that community as acceptance belonging to my **[574]** life, I have different kinds of present of community[[2]](#footnote-2): horizon of the family, horizon of the people, state-national horizon, European horizon, etc. determine the present of the respective communities and for me like for everyone in his current acting Ego-life, or rather, <they determine> the past and future currently belonging to them. But each present world of these different modes stands within a world, within a most external but endless horizon which as horizon of the known past and future transgresses all acquaintednesses. But which one? Whereby is this most external horizon determined?

Let us go back to the constitution of the present world as world of perception. I, as the one who I am, the mature man, have my all-human horizon, i.e. within my respective awake activities, in which each [activity] has its own special horizon, [I have] my habitual [horizon] “humanity” always already formed, contentually enhancing itself (possibly enlarging [itself]), which contains every special humanity that can become respectively a current “we” for me within my respective attitude. Their correlate is the world – the world as such as that [world] being actual for us all and being now, in which we are all living. Corresponding to the particularities of horizon, to the special human groups, and to the relative worlds, the special present of the all-world is effective if we simply have special interests. Certainly, if the ancient Greeks seriously regarded the foreign cultural peoples as barbarians, and did not accept them as fellow subjects of the world as such, they equated them with the abnormal, the mad ones within their own humanity, and thus the barbarian men and peoples did not in their opinion co-constitute <the> “mundane universe”. But however, it is agreed that each man who has a world, has his most external all-humanity, co-functioning for him within the constitution of the world, to which simply just normal “men” belong, who mutually acknowledge each other in the same way as being normal. The whole world-history, the world-past, and, envisaged by it as coming, the world-future, belong to their world as the <conscious world> within their awake living and in particular for every one being awake. But effectively it reaches as far as vivid history does. **[575]** This is in motion, like respectively the world as the universal current world (the most extreme present) concretely contains the whole past and from there the future; the effective past and future belong to the effective present of the world. But within the process of the ever new enlargement of historical memory (through the discovery of documents, of monuments, etc.) the past receives an ever more elaborated horizon in contrast to the empty horizon of undetermined ancestors of the ancestors.

Thus we learn to understand the time of the life-world as <the time> of the vivid present <world> within the flowing, time as form of the things being for us in their motion of the acceptance of being under correction and possible more closer and otherwise determination within proceeding experience and taking over of others’ experiences, of others’ probable and documented acceptances, accessible, to be criticized, etc. As men of our humanity we do have a world; it is accepted by us as unity, as idea, with its things being ideas, [with] our acceptances, in which the horizon of correction lies, in the acceptance of being as being actual [world] with the pre-conviction that the experiential determination will persist within the circle of humanity. This is our ground, this world – other human peoples have their acceptances, their world, but others are for us, as those of their world, being on our ground, and they do not carry with us that which we call “world”, or else they would also belong to our humanity. Certainly we have, like within our nation, the personal apperception in far too frequent dispute, thus also the national [apperceptions] of the different nations <are> in dispute. But if we <integrate> them into the unity of a humanity for the world at all, which is ours <and> everybody’s own, then this implies the pre-acceptance of the factual possibility of men as <men> of this humanity, to be able to communicate and to harmonize.

From there the ontology of the world itself as our world of things is to be understood which is prepared above, including at first the most original idealization of time – the form of ideally identically being things within the “change of time”, in their flowing as flowing present with flowing past and future in itself. This results in the difference of time as rigid system of places and <as> temporal modality, flowing time, flowing temporal modalization. The passing duration (of the passing lasting) results in a **[576]** past, which itself again passes, etc. And within this motion it is the same thing, the same duration, the same once-upon-a-time, namely the same uniqueness which has its behind-it or in-front-of-it, nothing but singularities. Time within the flowing is an identical order of the pasts as being identical, and that which now lasts is already conceived as coming past, as identical past vividly constituting, the future, that which is vividly coming, as being on the way to the identical past or in advance, as if it stood within the process of the unitary formation. But this becoming, this process is not only my subjective time-modal flowing, that of my acceptance of being, not concerning anybody else, but rather it implies the sense of the other idea, the idea of the being located within the connection with the other [members] of my humanity which is in constant acceptance of being as functioning subjectivity – from me respectively – and at the same time as worldly being from its own functioning.

Now the structure “nature” belongs to the ont<ological> structure of the life-world, and from there all things have a position within nature’s time, the spatial time, and everything which is not natural about them <has> its annexed position within it. The ontological [structure] is already idealized – not mathematized – as system of places, and each place is a point of time – not a mathematical point -, but to be constructed by way of the consideration of a limes. This ontologically ideal time in which all durations are, all beginnings and endings of durations, all “points of intersection” of beginnings of concurrent things with the focal points of a duration which appear as being cut out, etc., this time is the form of causality. In each flowing intuitional present we have a form of completeness persisting as unity within the flowing. When going through the pasts we find a community of form, a cohesiveness of forms, when going through the pasts and when varying, i.e. when objectivating possible pasts we find an invariant form, an invariant within all expectation and an invariant again within the continuity of a single world – the invariant form of the world, which is a mundane universe, and of each hypothetically rethought world – an all-temporal form. The durations of the things and their simultaneous forms enter this form, the spatial shapes as components [enter] this through the structure “nature”. This is the universal form of the life-worldly causality as form of the things, which already have their form. **[577]** As ont<ological> form this concerns the idealized world, which so to say <contains> everything as unity of flowing, which develops within the development of the sense, <within> the flowing, for example in open correction resulting in unanimity and new determinations as becoming known – a constant way of ideality which is anticipated within the flowing as intentional uniformity.

Within the universal causality of the being world, of the descriptive (of course description is related to the idealities), also men as well as animals and everything else are woven into. The universal causality relates to the factual within the time and the de facto human being belongs there, the de facto life and acting of the same within the world, the way it is in principle experienceable for everybody (in the wide sense). This holds true like for men thus for human communities.

Appendix XLVIII

Structures of the surrounding world according to the spheres of accessibility.

<The oriented time-world in its sections of accessibility of the world-present, world-past, world-future and within the horizons of inaccessibility stretching beyond that>[[3]](#footnote-3)

The lasting structure: World constitutes in a way according to the surrounding world as a world oriented from me, from us, <as> surrounding world of my, our actual and possible experience stretching into infinity, with a core “earthly world of bodies”, presenting itself to me as appearing in near-distant-appearances – this surrounding world of bodies, but at the same time with the world of celestial phenomena.

The endless surrounding world of bodies within the constant (but in itself relative shiftable) form: our actually experienced body-world within the evidence sphere belonging to perception of the directly to be verified anticipation by way of possibly to be produced wider perception (original inductive **near sphere**) and the continuously co-accepted inductive **distant sphere**: Within the process of perception we constantly have: 1) an evidently accessible field of that which is unperceived, but perceivable, 2) a distant field not actually, not evidently being possibly available. – Thus **[578]** everyone at first for himself, and in the correspondingly changed sense this is transferred to each “we”.

My “we” is the range of the fellow subjects respectively actually available for me through perception, the totality of co-present persons with whom I could come into connection, from whom I could receive messages, the actual experience of whom I could adopt, and vice versa. As this “we” we have our common world, that is, as the [world] being ideally univocally accepted by us, or rather, to be cognized by us through mutual correction. But therein we have a **core of actually experienced and experienceable, at first perceptual common world**, certainly ideally. Since a “we” is being accepted by me and by everyone, thus thereby the sphere of accessibility of any “we” is determined, that is, as that which everyone and all collectively actually experience of the world and can experience under the idea of the compensability of discrepancies, concerning single things (like within everyone’s own experience). The section of our perception’s world, and of our actual perceptibility is in such a way **mobile**, as ever new things are being perceived, and these new things open up new inductive anticipations, and new possibilities of actual designation. But constantly the fact remains, that **my** **field of accessibility** and **our** field of accessibility is a **section** beyond which the world stretches; a **horizon of inaccessibility** remains.

We have spoken of the **present world**, simply the perceptual [present world]. In a corresponding way this is transferred to past and future. The world, constituted as **time-world**, has a memory-past for me, that is the one which has been perceived by me; in each former present I had a sphere of evidence of that part of the world, and of each object, which had actually been perceivable for me. Thus a continuity of fields of the world-past which currently have been perceivable. And thus I have a unity of the **section of the world-temporal past** as a **core sphere** for the whole continuity of past and current (present) perceptual present [German text plural, translator’s note]. In a corresponding way then again concerning the “we”. Furthermore likewise for the pre-designed **world-future** and [for] each pre-designed future present, however undetermined and implicit it may be.

My current present: I as subject of my world-perception with the horizon of the accessible world-present. Thereby the present of the world has its horizon world-past and [world]-future, and my world-perception [has] the horizon of the continuity of my memory, in which that part of the world-past is conspicuous as a special field which is memory for me; likewise for the world-future the “section” of my pre-memory.

That which is perceived of the world, that part of it which is currently cognized by me, and furthermore is known. The memory past: that which already has been cognized, now is known, simply as having been for me. But the perceptual present also has something present which is recognized; explicated: It is something remembered, and still being. That which is current for me and originally present in its persisting being within its changing or remaining unchanged has its current horizon of originally evident coming, the original future, vividly predelineating itself within the flowing. And thus it belongs to every past perception. The currently being, [the] persisting being further persists – given along within perception, actually to be counted among perception itself, or rather among the current concrete present, thereby “**perceptual future**” in contrast to the induced, pre-memorial future. Likewise we have with regard to the past within concrete present its [the present’s] own **originally vivid vanishing**, in contrast to the induced past of memory.

We have to note as well, that we, everyone for himself, have a **section of accessibility** also regarding the universal world-past within the complete past of memory. By remembering the world-past becomes subjectively accessible. The originally having been accrued possibility of memory which we are evidently certain of, results in a possibly to be given on its own accord, thus accessible past – of the world.

This possibility of access is **limited**. Within random going-back-into the-memory-past I eventually arrive at something ultimate, and yet the last remembered, namely that which has been brought to current vivid intuitional representation, is still equipped with a horizon of the past, the way it essentially belongs to memory. But I cannot actualize this horizon as memory any more. I “cannot go any further”, although it is possible on the other hand, that I still go further, whereby the situation repeats itself. Thereby a **limes of possible memory** is predelineated. While going back I approach something memorially ultimate.[[4]](#footnote-4) Thereby we have to heed that we are standing within the constituted world of objective temporality, and that memory has always already and constantly the sense: memory of what has been worldly.

More closely, how about the accessibility within the world-present? How is the possibility to currently perceive something worldly present, and to verify it by perceiving (or <to> de-verify it), limited, whereas **[580]** everything being accepted by me as present lies within an “endless” world-horizon, here: within the space?

The approaching itself (like I myself as its human subject which thereby governs in a bodily way) is within the objective world-time and time of “causality”. In each phase the new perception predelineates something new which can be cognized, as being available nearby.

1. 8th August 1936. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Clubs, practical work organizations, faculties, horizon of the faculty, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. January 1934. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. But this concerns an ultimate singularity only insofar as it refers to ultimate „former“ spheres of perception. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)