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<Constitution of acquaintedness and novelty due to association of similarity. Beginnings of world constitution in the interest life of the Ego, starting with the instinct-Ego>[[1]](#footnote-1)

The[[2]](#footnote-2) evidently pre-delineated, arriving at perception, is within the frame of typical total apprehension, in which every perceived real, even if it is something new, is understood, which is thus always something known. But this is not a proper “objectivation”, or a proper thought, a proper feature at the appearing, namely <that>, which belonged to its objective content. Generally spoken: Acquaintedness[[3]](#footnote-3) is a mode of consciousness, that is, a quite general one, in which anything is conscious, and it is not a mode of acceptance (certainty, etc.), but a mode of that, which is accepted. It is not a moment belonging to the What as a what-content itself, no property-moment or a part, no ont<ic> connection, form or relation, but a subjective How of the having, which of course somehow is also given in thematic modes. But acquaintedness is a manifold way in the having of some content; there are different modes of acquaintedness. They are all modes in the universal horizonedness, but special ones, horizon-like in a special way. I annotate here that the vague talking of emotion is not seldom used in such a wide way, that it encompasses all subjective modes, all modes in one, in which that, which is thematic respectively (in which thematic modes ever), is conscious. It is a different “noematic” character within the thematic, which thus is not well expressed by way of talking of “qualities of acquaintedness”.

[250] Horizon[[4]](#footnote-4) as a universal mode of consciousness is a counter title to the thematic consciousness-of, to the *intentio*, <to be> directed towards something as something, to be directed in some mode of acceptance.

Here some closer consideration is needed. Horizon means a mode of the having consciousness-of, but in contrast to the intention in the sense of direction a counter mode of “intentionality”; that which is no proper intention, leads over to such a one, possibly. I can “examine every horizon-like” “on its unthematic sense”. What is actually present here?

Something seems to be familiar to me. I am for example directed towards some object, this armchair over here, I look at it, etc. I explicate its perceptual What in a perceiving way, the content of determination; constant acquaintedness, whether it has the mode of individual acquaintedness or of the general one, while this individual is new to me, is not explicated thereby. It transcends everything. It may be, that I say at the same time, or rather, am conscious without any talking of it “Such a curved armrest is unknown to me, is new.” Then we have a general acquaintedness and within the same at the same time a break of acquaintedness. The new complies to the general style of acquaintedness, the total style armchair, and at the same time the armrest differs from it.

It needs to be heeded above all that when talking of the modes of acquaintedness, novelty itself is such a mode, that is, a negative mode, necessarily presupposing a ground of positivity, of acquaintedness in the most pure and simple sense. But this is itself a big theme, the build-up of the totality of acquaintedness and of the acquaintedness of situations fit into it, and in relation to that all respective modes of unacquaintedness.

Let us remain with the question though, how acquaintedness is to be addressed as intentionality or possibly points to some intentionality, and let us continue that which has been explicated above: Even if I am directed to something in a perceiving way, this something is known, but I am not directed towards the being known. I am directed towards all that, which is ont<ically> meant in a predicative and relational way in this something.

The acquaintedness in its determined mode (mode of the univocal total acquaintedness as armchair, going through all explicit and implicit ont<ic> contents, or else in a break at some point, so that it delineates a predicative moment as new) is a character of the content, distributed in special features on the content parts and moments. [251] I can direct myself towards this character now or else towards its single features. What happens? I am lead back towards my past, into the realm of my memories, that is, into memories, in which the same, or rather, something equal, similar or different cases of such a thing have been perceived. What is present there, considered more closely? The retentionally sunken similar thing, the now past thing, is woken up, becomes effectively affective, some advertance happens. But of course we need to say, even if I am directed towards the ont<ic> and not towards its acquaintedness, acquaintedness itself is everywhere an association of similarity, is being woken up by something similar. <There is> not only this constant association, constant fusion under unity-formation, in the passive primal streaming as a constant retentional change, but also <some association> as a constitution of temporality of the unities as being ones individuated according to coexistence and time of succession.

Acquaintedness, awakeness of something similar and thanks to the fusion of similarity (pairing) some relationship-character. Analogously, if something is within some configuration, I do not need to pay attention, but it has a relationship-character as its member. If I pay attention to this, it means I turn towards the connection with the other members, the configuration becomes thematic in the attitude towards this member and in its way to be within the whole.

Thus something similar is in unity of a perceptual field with something similar in a configuration of similarity, possibly with different objects at the same time, on top of that lying in different directions (these different directions are again themselves similar and configured), at first in perceptual coexistence, in which they all are perceptually-there, at-the-same-time-there – as onta, and <they are> attendant, whether they are “noticed” <or not>, that is, whether they are poles of the current Ego-interest, or an unnoticed background objectivity as a background constellation. If something singular (of a configuration) is within the pole, in the “direction” of the interest in that, which I “drive at” or which I wish to transgress, then the co-configured similar has a distinguished and unitary background character (I mean the similarity as such of the same generic type determined through the apperception of the pole). In a certain way I have it in view as well, in a special way of affection, without the interest actually being divided (and weakened), thus perchance <there is> still some distribution of interest. “Noticed in passing” is ambiguous. It does not mean here that a unity of interest, having the unity of an aim, has its mediation and distribution of interests within itself [252], that its fulfilling goes through mediating poles being distributed within time among coexisting and succeeding mediations within the fulfillment. There is always the difference between that which “has its time” now, to actualize this mediating purpose right now, to engage with this useful object in a mediating way, while something else is already within the field as temporally put back, noticed in passing, in such a way that the noticing means a ray of interest having the direction of the whole interest constantly directed towards the final aim within the unity.

The having-in-view-in-passing, being-noticed-in-passing of some mere configuration of similarity as such needs to be separated thus distinctly from that. Obviously it needs to be noticed as well, unitarily there for us in a special way, if it incrementally builds up from partial pluralities becoming noticed.

Eventually we have the complete perceptual field as an object field, a total perceptual background, according to its special configuration in configurative segmentations as a perceptual background, as that which is in a certain sense without interest, with the exception of that, which is respectively “interesting” at the time.

But on a deeper look the background is also a title as such for modes of interest.

All object constitution happens in the interaction of affection and action. Life is always already life of interest, originally guided by the instinct in its constitutive development, and then by interests already presupposing affection of affecting onta sprung from the activity of interests. These are formations of interests. The original attainment as a way towards an aim and completed at the aim, in the streaming life – which is generally a retentional change. But this <implies> the unity of the creating-oneself, fulfilling special interests in the change of the Ego-modes, of that which is accepted as indeed attained, and then in one with the retentional change still-being-accepted, furthermore-being-accepted, and likewise for the whole of the Ego activity. This whole “sinks away” after the attainment, the double-sided retentionality proceeds, on the Ego side that of keeping and having. But the Ego is constantly awake, it is always affected and attained anew; that which happens at the same time is not isolated, and not only in that it emerges anew in the unity of a retentional stream as an originally vivid attainment and then sinks away into the infinite, while soon something new ensues. Association constantly functions, and this implies constant repetition, constant similarity and pairing of similarity. [253] The Ego is an instinct-Ego on the primal step with undiscovered instinctive aims. The instinct runs through different modes, it is fulfilled, and now the aim of fulfillment is patent and as attained in its patent sense on the way having become patent. The instinct has not reached its end by that, it takes over new modes – I am furthermore constantly an instinct-Ego, and constantly the process of discovering goes on as an act process – mode of the new hunger, mode of the new attainment on a similar “passive” basis. The consciousness of repetition lies within the new attainment. The new case is known now. It has entered a pairing with the sunken and still retentionally sinking first case. The old is woken amounts to the same, and the new has taken in the sense of the old in the coincidence of similarity as similarization, <as> an associative extension, beginning with the beginning of the pairing and predelineating future from the beginning on. I am the same Ego, I am still in the will of instinct, and in the repetition, in the similar, I, as the one I am, still want the same, now in the repeated originality, originally.

But how much ever constant repetition plays its role, it does not remain a mere repetition. Association happens in a different way. Instinct is one and yet a manifoldness of special interests, which may compete, and yet not disclosed, but only temporally put back. We also have coexistence from temporalization – in the passivity of the sensual fields and of their respective constellations of “data”, of something not yet being, the pairing and associative transmission of Ego-targeting and attainment in the simultaneity, manifold affection and subjective primacy with the help of the way of givenness of the one, while the other one has the sense of “food” and the like from associative transmission. Thus life continues. The unities of interest newly acquired through constitution are primal institutions by way of the essential repetition through simultaneous and successive association on the basis of continued acceptance, which has not vanished by way of “sinking”, with its sense of path and goal.

But now the restraints, the negativities. The restraint to take ready food oneself due to instinctive fear. The failure; motivation for intuitive memory. The untamed hunger awakens associatively, awakens the past one and its fulfilling, creates the intuition as a quasi-perception and quasi-satisfaction as compensation, which soon sets into motion the activity of searching, etc.

From such solid beginnings, the build-up of the world as an acceptance streamingly mobile in the streaming life, correlatively <the> build-up of [254] the interest-Ego, of the Ego, which always has its manifold and still unitarily combined interests, interests with regard to the world always already being for it, being in mobile current givenness of perceived, memorized, expected onta, with which the Ego always serves its interests anew, from which it can gain new interests, and all that in the having a world of a horizonedness, the mobility and sense of which is the big problem.

The I is something identical within the streaming in the change of its interests, in the change of its abilities. As a mature Ego it has its universe of affection with the world, that one being accepted by it as being in horizonedness. The unities of being in the subjective “being accepted by the Ego respectively” being for it, e.g. those ones being intuitively present for it, associate in the subjective time.

There <is an> instinctive striving at the “beginning” in first directions of fulfillment, by which it is discovered in the way of its aims and a purposeful activity arises, as well as habitual acquisitions and ever new awakening of the requirements of a distinct sense of aiming. In this on-going interest life and already-having-in-the acquisition-of-interests and having-under-correction-in-continued-acceptance the I remains what it had been, I of the “instincts”, of the strivings, the originally only now developed ones, equipped with aim-objectivations, ever new special aims, ever higher development of the interests. And yet: The I is the same, it is the unity of a striving, which is driving in it, a total instinct, having its effect in all act life, discovering and yet driving on through all intent and having, bringing new fulfillment with which that which the I “aims at”, is discovered anew.

No. 58

<Note on the phenomenon of coincidence and fusion, equality and similarity>

Acquaintedness, cognition, recognition, recognition as something equal, as something similar to its generic, its typical; the similarity itself as a “rough” similarity, that is, mode of the similarity; full similarity as pure repetition, a special and limit mode.

I speak of “distant coincidence” (association) in the similarity, in the transgression of “congruent coincidence” with the modes fusion of congruence [255], in which there is no tangible “difference”, no “distance”, or: The duality (pair) has become a simple unity in the situation of congruence. The other mode having its degree is that indeed a unity emerges, but in the “feeling” of difference. The same explicates and different ones may then again differ in the explication and emerge that these different ones “make” the whole ones differ even prior to the explication. Equality and similarity in general already emerge in the mode of distant coincidence (fusion of distance).

These fusions may then be called (more or less) smooth ones or all-sided, total fusions.

In contrast to that we have congruences, fusions under distance, under differing, annulling unity and indeed producing a two-unity, but under reciprocal displacement into covering. A total unification may thereby take place at one piece (in equality or close-similarity).

Streaming covering of the primal present (primal field of perception – hyletic field) in the stream of retention through total similarity. But how about discretions, distinct pieces in the field, in the association of simultaneity? We have here some primal discretion as distance within a combining similarity (still producing concretion, fusion), going through the whole field, making it a concrete unity. <There are> thus many self-contained concretions being distant on the basis of the concretion. But what makes a self-contained concretion? Continuity, at first continuity of place, immediate local neighborhood in simultaneous fusion, then continuing in the fusion of the immediate wider neighborhood, etc. This continuity leaves no discontinuity. But a place is only a locality of quality. Locality and quality are not associated, are not “concrete” from concretion, from fusion. Only that which is concrete in the other sense, local quality, can fuse. Both sides are associatively determining, locality creates unity of the field as a local field of qualities. By these qualities necessarily having localities they have an immediate and mediate neighborhood and options of qualitative immediate or distanced neighborhood and options of the qualitative immediate or distanced fusion, but also options for breaks of fusion, for the other kind of distance or difference. A continuous qualitative similarity may accompany in immediacy the local continuation from neighbor to neighbor; [256] an association according to local closeness and distance, stepped though according to constant similarity. But similarity may take place instead of complete equality and similarity [may] be stepped in the qualities themselves.

No. 59

<Note on locality and quality as constituents of fusion and discretion>

The immediate similarity in the continuity from place to place, that is, in the immediate close-to-another, may lead to unification, but the local distant qualities have a qualitative distance. But also immediately adjacent qualities may indeed have similarity (and must have it in a local field), but still discretion, qualitative difference. The local fusion is not to be abolished, and a distinction grows. The places where discretion happens, have a distinction, they have continuity on the one hand and (qualitative) discontinuity on the other in the field continuity; the locally determined quality has in a concrete way the character of continuity and discontinuity in one, unity and abolishing of unity. This needs some further explanation: “Point” is nothing for itself, borderline.

Let us now consider succession instead of simultaneity: homogenous continuity – “sudden” happening of leaps, or vice versa.

Retentionalizing as covering in continuous succession. Place in the succession in continuous change, that is, immediately new present and mediately covering that which has just been present. Do we not need to distinguish the continuous changing into the just-now, just-now of just-now, etc. and continuous covering? We have a constant streaming away of continuously immediate and mediate time places.

[257]

No. 60

<Instincts in their universal unity and in the order of discovering. The instinct of objectivation as a special instinct>[[5]](#footnote-5)

Genesis.[[6]](#footnote-6) Intentionality. The I in the modes of intentionality, in the drive, in the being satisfied and being unsatisfied, striving from fulfilling to new fulfillings; each fulfilling is relative, each with a horizon of the unfulfilled emptiness.

Instinct. Undiscovered at the “beginning”. Relative satisfaction enriching itself in the process, eventually being satisfied. Each phase a desire, a fulfilled and soon new desire, new fulfilling, each decrease a missing, thus in continuity. State of the being satisfied as a mode of the drive-I, as mode of striving. Constant decrease (in the mode of fulfilling making the joy!) of the desire’s intensity in the enjoying desiring (in eating). The desire as a joy has its zero-intensity in the repletion, it fades away in the retentionality. This zero is not the stopping of the Ego act, simply by way of retention, it is in the mode of keeping, without desire. But also this mode of the desireless repletion has its degree of decreasing down to its zero. But this zero has its duration temporarily, it changes into its negativity. Its character of its quiet desire sprung from fulfilled desire, the satisfied repletion, changes into hunger, into the awakening of some increasing “corresponding” new desire.

Instinct as a general expression for different special instincts. Each desire of a special instinct has its specific direction, its specific character of joy, its specific acquisitions, its specific repletion. This is quality of pleasure corresponding to the quality of desiring.

The different hyletic then distinguishes itself in the fulfilling, in the joy, as a core from the quality being similar in kind, but differing according to the hyle. E.g. different meals – but pleasure of eating, hunger for a meal, well-being of repletion as repletion of eating, discovering of [258] the respective instinct, and in one the I itself experiences different meals, that the hunger is related to one meal, and differentiates hunger “for” this or that kind of meal.

Co-existence and concurrence of the special instincts in their modes of impact. Every instinct is immortal, it is only in different modes of actualization. Concurrence means conflict of desires – thus stimuli co-existing within an instinct and awakened desires can already conflict, and then also those of different kinds of the highest genres of desire, different instincts.

In the play of instincts: the recollection, identifying, differing – prior to an already constituted “objectivity” from appearances. Recognition of a date as content of a joy, while being replete. Stimulus to desire, reinstating of the desire when no more being completely replete.

Order of instincts in the impact and in the process of discovering. Can we talk of an original instinct of “objectivation”?

Interest in sense data within sense fields – prior to the objectivation sense dates as core of the desire for nutrition – this instinct as first in the order of instinctive activities has no objects as to be thematically actualized ones.

Shall we posit the instinct of objectivation as a second original instinct (according to the order of actualization on the way of vividly desiring intention and fulfilling)?

The desire for nutrition is satisfied. Sense data (which shall not be cores of the desires for nutrition) hold an attraction, attract. The question is here, in what way the involuntary kinesthetics plays its part, and together with the change of date in such a way that both combine, and in the form of the constitution of appearance with a unity of appearance, correlatively with a corresponding voluntary and ordered kinesthetic process as motivating for the series of appearances corresponding to it, and proceeding as a motivation ending in the “It itself”. Hyletic “passivity”, kinesthetic “I do”, doing as a qualified continuity of some “I do”, proceeding from the Ego, “by which” the change of the date happens; by way of anticipation of the “best” as the similar, good, but less perfect, which proceeds in the row of similarity, but is getting closer to it, the shining through is created within the change, the appearing of the end in degrees of “approach”. Practice in repetition, recognition of unities of appearance, transmission through similarity. [259] Every distinct date of the sense field is apperceived as an “object”. The perceptual field with its configuration of distinct data apprehended as a configuration of objects. Constitution of a field of object perception not only static, but also dynamic; Objects disappear and return as the same ones. Objects in stillness and in motion, objects in change. Unchange as primal mode and afterwards as a liminal case of change. Further build-up of the object’s world as (primordial) nature – but only a stretch. Natural linking of the object constitutions of the sense fields, the same showing itself in different senses.

Constitution of co-humanity, of the togetherness and the sexual instinct. The most primitive personal acts, “emotions”, desires, fulfillings, related to mother, nurse, fostress, family, etc.

As everywhere something negative: instinctive fear, not sympathy, but personal antipathy (also being averted against meals, disgust). Linking of the thing objectivation with the personal empathy, but also with the performance of the nutritional instinct (fellow human beings objective – as body, but together with them the subjects reigning in them and through them; bodies as meals).

In all that: The (not objectivating) instincts, now having an impact, now satisfied; constituted an object surrounding, the object cores, having the “meaning” of goods, as the case may be instinctively arousing a desire, being able to arouse. Change of habit, thereby fellow human beings in a personal connection and I as taking part in my wishes, etc., and fellow human beings as the surrounding world, as objects being there, like meals when I am not hungry.

<The> problem of the building of *doxa*, the pure objective acceptance of being belonging to the surrounding world under abstraction of taking part in a desiring way or being-able-to-<take part> or not.

No.61

<Constitution of the world in the living development and constant verification of relative acceptances and their harmonizing in the community>

The world is in itself, in it the nature in itself, in its ontological form, therein the form of spatio-temporality, in which all realities coexist in a locally unambiguously determined way: it holds true for every point in time, that something real has an inexistence in the room, etc.

[260] Transcendentally: The world is the unity of acceptance and verification constituting itself in the streaming vividness of transcendental subjectivity, streamingly constituting itself in the way of a unitary intentional temporalization, within it always process of primal modally emerging acts with primal modal attainment, which now have an unrestricted impact, partially experience a restriction. That which is respectively attained in an intentional way and in the process towards newly beginning acts change of the old acts and of their results into keepings in incessantly changing modes. All new activity <rests> on the basis of some passivity and receptivity, i.e., on the basis of the preserved acquisitions, of the ability of their awakening and reception as re-activation. All activity is activity in the horizon, in which the actual and possible targets lie. The universal life, transcendentally-concrete unity of the intentionality, unity of the intentional having in the streaming, in the course of ever new constitution of having, of new acquisitions, under accompanying intention for univocality, for the removal of restrictions, for the removal of modalizing in transmission into new univocality.

Transcendental instinct – in a sense the universal tendency going through the totality of the Ego’s intentionality – the constant universal teleology.

The world is constantly constituted, but also constantly constitutes itself in the unity of the teleological, of the constituting life, [the world] in which the constituting subjectivity constantly finds itself as being secularized. The constituting I develops in the constituting of the world as an I of its univocal acceptances, as that constantly in the unity of some further striving towards ever farther reaching universal univocalities of acceptance and thereby towards some further development of its own Ego-being; this implies, towards some ever more complete, ever more withstanding universal satisfaction. This development in its respective form of development (its state) and the streaming actuality of its progress emerges in an objectivated way in the human striving for development (and thus <in> all animal [striving]).

With regard to the constituted world as furthermore constituting itself we have the constant horizonedness, on top of that the ability, to make “intuitive” the respective accepted-being world as the “actual and possible” experience (univocality of experience) and to thereby apprehend the essential form, the ontological one, in which world is actual as one of the options, into which that, which is now actually accepted as known and inductive enters as a core, the core of actual experience and induction, certainly itself with an element of possibility, namely which part of that [261] can be kept so to say as actual actuality in future modalization.

But initially world is constituted as a surrounding life-world (as a pre-scientific one). Also, a systematic sense-investigation, as a systematic making intuitive of the being sense world is not performed according to fact and options, not to be presupposed, or rather, nor an ontology designed as essential structure of a possible world or just a goal; thus this ont<ological> structure going through all de facto world life, “lying” in its world apperception is constantly implied through a “draft”, protention of the already constituted, and is an acquisition implied in the already constituted. If science, and on the deepest layer natural science constitutes a higher scientific world and world structure due to this ont<ological> structure of the surrounding world, then it believes to contrast thereby an absolute form with the relativity of all that is belonging to the surrounding world and its opennesses, [a form] which <goes> into infinity, which is kept in all future constitution, and allows to reconstruct all conceivable modalizing changes on the course towards univocality.

How could the beginning universal science (philosophy), whose task had emerged through a “theoretic” wish to intrude into the opennesses of the known surrounding life-world and in the wish for universality as cognition of universality – how could it have proceeded otherwise than intuitively follow the “persisting being” in the change of possibilities and to thereby eventually arrive at the universal ont<ological> structures? It gains through it <the> idea of the constant true being of the world and the claim for necessary cognition.

But it arrives at this claim in a naivety of the method, with which its paradoxes are combined and which anyway do not result in any binding cognition in advance, no doubtlessly clarified rule of the method, <like> actual and possible experience needs to proceed always and necessarily within the constitution. To make the constitution a theme, the actual, experientially accepted world in its openness, and as such make [it] a theme in its subjective How of acceptance, in its way of horizonedness, at first in the way possible activity of experience does and may alone proceed, and in the way experience ever again opens up new possibilities, ever again deduces possibilities through actualities, in order to open up new possibilities as then pre-delineated ones in the open range, that is, ambiguously protentional ones. It is only then the question what theoretical attitude and science do perform, what they intend, what they may result in, and a question, which constantly presupposes [262] that the constituting life and its different activities do proceed (just that they are temporarily restricted here and there through the scientific attitude and then are again controlled).

The first is here necessarily the sense-investigation on the way “the” world is accepted as one and the same world, and remains being accepted, as world is accepted in the original way of experience, that is, of the experience of some changing single real thing and fields of experience of something real, like any such acceptance of some single thing then has its reality in the experiencing (from which all experiential cognition and all non-intuitive pre-meanings derive): on the experiencing subjects; the same object experienced by me, by other ones and communalization of acceptance experienced in the community, thereby always something experienced in the relativity within the openness with regard to that, which has not yet been experienced of the same object in a horizoned way.

Again: The modalizing going through here and through everything, the becoming-at-strife-with-oneself, the going-through-doubt-and-negation, the constantly-being-certain-of-possible-creation-of-univocality.

Furthermore the relativity of the perceptual features towards the bodily sensuality, the backward relatedness of the being acceptances of every natural thing towards the bodiliness and its functioning within perception. Etc.

We are here within the activity of experience and <the> induction being based in experience as mine, as our, as ability of everyone, as my and our acquisition in constant relativity. World is constantly a subjectively oriented world (at first nature) in relativities of close and distant, in the experiential community and conscious community, also in the subjective shape of openness, of acquaintance – unacquaintance, of undetermined, but determinable possibility, etc.

There is the conviction within the natural human life, prior to any science, but already in the human subject of consciousness, that it needs to be drawn a distinction between subjective being accepted and something accepted on the one hand and objectively correct being accepted, or rather, a true being corresponding to something subjective, and that it is possible to show true being in a subjective or rather inter-subjective way.

The subject does not merely perform in a straight way the activity of experience, of the inductive anticipation, the experience looking backwards, etc. It has always and often enough been motivated to reflect on that from modalizing, above all within communalization. My own Ego and my own body in which I reign, through which I do not only perceive, but also have an impact in a naturally changing way relating to the surrounding world, in connection with other [263] Ego reigning in their bodies, etc. – there is everywhere something being, which is simply certain to me as something worldly, some being from my activity of acceptance, from our common one, and accepted by me, likewise by everyone, as verifiable, as to be questioned, to be shown in its being as a being for us all, with the option possibly of deception, of non-being, of non-being then for all, etc. All these are acquisitions of activities, simple ones and of a higher order, whereby still in spite of the intersubjectivity being the frame in advance, still this same points for me and then for everyone towards acts and acquisitions of acts.

Sense-investigation of the world leads us back to the manifold modes of experiential activity and <to the> activities resting on experience, all making accepted and basing acceptance on acceptance, acceptance is univocally connected with acceptance or it becomes discordant. <I am> always an Ego subject knowing itself to be in egoical communalization (but knowing of one another only from activities of acceptance <in> the way of foreign experience, and respectively directed towards something being accepted by them, which is an acquisition of acceptance, to which every new act contributes.

The question on the founding of acceptance, on the whole system of acceptance thus is also the one on subjectivity, constantly performing productions of acceptance and already having acquisitions of acceptance – constitution of the world as the one being for subjectivity, as being from its activities of acceptance.

But this first still is meant the following way: world is essentially accepted by us in a horizonlike way, and the horizon is the horizon of acceptance with the respective core of a perceptive acceptance, which <we> though, however close we take it, distinguish into a properly self-giving certainty of perception and acceptance of horizon connoting its sense – all horizon-like though is an ability to go over to new experiences, from which new predelineations emerge, with new paths of verifying actual perception, on top of that always an empty horizon without a determined predelineation, but always with the sense of possible experiential ways with unknown, undetermined predelineations then belonging to it. World in the streaming course of the experiencing life is for us living ones. It is, this means: We are in the experiences and from there <in> positings of being, at the same time in a well-established ability of possible experiences, possible inductions, possible verifications, etc, which we can give a succession from every point, whether directing further experience towards next opened up options as predelineated ones, whether the options *in infinitum* and to construct from there, if they came, their predelineations, their options and so on as a world view.

[264] An open system of acceptances of being, iteratively to be opened, to be made intuitive, [acceptances of being] making up the building of the streaming world acceptance as that of the univocality of acceptance (in one of the disjunctive options). Thus world is always accepted thereby – I am in the world acceptance, I have the horizon as pre-cast of the possible acceptances and of those implying a unity of univocality. And every such analysis of acceptance singles out some acceptances on the ground of world acceptance. Possibly single actual and possible experiences being in their sense experience of something worldly, of something from the world. I, the experiencing one (and likewise any other one as co-Ego), am a human I thereby, I accept my body belonging to the world; I perceive through it, etc.

No. 62

<Retention, protention and I-activity in the recollection. Identifiable individual being as presupposition of recollection>[[7]](#footnote-7)

Recognition[[8]](#footnote-8) lies within the unity of retention streaming from my present. I have the perceived A in it, associatively awakening the “former” A’, still changing while streaming away in the declining retention. But the kind of retention is constancy of the continuity of covering, and also the awakening is awakening in the covering. That which is awakened in the recognition is covered. But there are differences. The merely passive association and its “awakening” is to be distinguished from the awakening of the activity [coming] from present activity. Only this leads to recollection as re-perception, re-activity.

I have background objects in the present perceptional sphere. I have a passive awakening here in the “co-existence” as co-present in discretion on the ground of the field’s continuity (eventually continuity of the sensual fields), continuity of the fusion and discontinuity as a break of fusion, distinction of discontinuous unities, and associations of similarity (distant awakening, distant fusion). All this happens in an open, uncovered way here. Saying: “The similar reminds of the similar”, this is not related to mere association, but to activity; the actively experienced object (the active in actualizing) leads me to the inactively present similar in the background, to reactivate <now> the passively changed activity, in which it had an original sense of being. And possibly following this motive I enter a plural perceiving, a synthetically connecting one, a collecting knotting together under keeping. Thus in the constituted word, I as affected in the perceptual field and moving therein in an active way, but the changing of recollection already plays its part there.

We have a retentional fusion, distinction, formation of unity, distant fusion under covering in the successive association, for one in the sphere in which present is constituted as perceived in a lasting way, then in the sphere constituting past of something not present.

The activity standing within present actively awakens the activity in the similar covered in the past and changed in retentionalizing. Simply thereby “the covering is lifted”, or rather, the advertence changes into “repetition” in a fulfilling way, into which a repeated present as an “intuitive picture” and “repeated” activity (a mode of actual activity) enters: recollection.

Accordingly we had to say: Also background recollections (pictures of memory) “breaking in” have their motive in a momentarily placed back but still vivid activity. The becoming-affective of something covered can be motivated from side-interests and in an indirect way; also from actual (intuitive) recollections. There is still much to be conceived of. Intuitions of memory falling in within the background? Dream?

By the recollection being based on association of similarity and awakening of current present (or already current recollections), the need to spring back to past instead of the ability to continuously “stream back” to past is explained. Continuously from a past being intuitive already in springing, in which I am a re-experiencing Ego within the “As-if”, I draw closer to future by my performing continuously the “former” activity, by my remaining in the performance of the As-if.

Originally: I have a streaming present with a phase of fulfillment in the streaming, <the> retentional and protentional horizon – in the streaming the intention (the complete one) retentionalizing itself, the Now in one with it <going over> into retention, (determining) the protention continuously fulfilling itself [266]. This streaming event itself retentionalizing and protentionalizing itself in this structure and in its respective content, fulfilling as a respective Now (concretely with a horizon). Simply thereby the momentary total retention, phase of the Now and total protention of this whole’s streaming itself and in retentions of this whole thing, etc. is to distinguished. Thus it is obvious that every retentional phase as well is a fulfilling, likewise every protentional phase, understood as a total retention and moreover as a phase of it. Every total phase is simply “now”, each one has its total protention as a moment of the Now, but as an “intention” of future, etc.

The Ego’s beam of action is constantly directed towards future in the normal present life by its being constantly directed towards the core Now, the one fulfilling the act intention, simply as in which the strived at actualizes itself. If “a” past is awakened and again vivid, then the Ego lives “again” in an active way within; the whole streaming and in acts (from concrete present into concrete present, etc.) living-into-the-future is “repeated”. It discovers what is already covered within the retentional stream, streamingly remained in a constant change of self-covering.

In recollection I live in constant protention towards the future; and the way protention is: next something predelineated, incompletely determined, fulfilling itself, but often within the “different” (although simply within a general ontological form); the distant horizon vague. (The retentional past is covered, but not “vague”, undetermined!) All this is repeated with its predelineations, etc., it is repeated, since it has all “been” already, it is preserved in streaming retention and is only discovered.

But the discovering has its going into future, the discovering as recollection is an event and <an> act process of the present Ego in its concrete life present. Certainly in such a way that this has its original field, which is covered though by its memory intuition (totally or partially). The interest belonging to the perceptual sphere and the original striving for future is “pushed downwards” (inhibited or, if the activity keeps on, still changed, continuing in a “mechanical” way). The present activity of the I in the process of the continuous recollection is a course from the activity in the mode of re-perceiving, being-again-present, into future – into the future that has become; I have a future horizon in the mode Again now currently active within recollecting, active in the intentional changed form re-active. But I do not only have the unfulfilled horizon of expectation with its respective predelineation in the current present recollection, but still unfulfilled as [267] predelineation. I do not only have my strived at, at best (in detail, simply in predelineation) hoped for and yet unknown, undetermined, “uncertain” future. Rather: The future has already come, is already completely determined, is simply a past which has already happened, as the “later” one in contrast to the “former”.

But this leads makes me wonder. I already know in the past now remembered in a concrete way, in the activity, in the quasi-living-into-the-future in quasi-present, I, activating the present in the mode of memory, that which has come afterwards, how the intending has been fulfilled, how the concrete present (concrete possibly in the mode of different and yet in the frame of the ontological form) has come about; and if I, continuously letting myself into memory, simply am continuously active in the changed way, I still know in advance of the future that has happened, I indeed do have my future horizon as a horizon, but as a horizon known and completely determined in advance in the mode of memory, in the mode of Again. I do not have at that point indeed a horizon of the Again, but still an undetermined one, an uncertain one, so that I had to wait for what is to come. Striving on I already know in advance and I can even enter, spring forwards into the horizon without an actual intuition; right now I am still within the memory of planning – I spring forwards towards the end, to that of actualization, and remaining there I make it an active recollection.

If we go back to the current, not changed concrete present, then its concrete structure is not a mere next-to-one-another, the retentional streaming away of the concrete present is in every phase not a mere next-to-one-another having a continuous change of covering streamingly as a whole and in every phase. Rather, the change of total retention is thus that a constant and ever new synthesis takes place in it giving sense to the whole (apart from the change of sense it receives by continuous retentionalizing) out of activity from <the> continuous “new”. We have in every concrete present (as a moment of constantly streaming original present) the “comet’s tail” retention, on the other hand protention actualized with the point of fulfillment Now (of the protention). The newly entering fulfilling obviously begins a constant synthesis with the changing protention; and the protential horizon of a phase, retentionalizing in streaming does not merely remain this protentional horizon, but it begins a synthesis with that which gives him a fulfilling later, and it retentionalizes with this synthesis.

[268] One would say though that the activity had priority here and that the synthesis primarily relates to the activity, that is, that Ego synthesis is in its activity with itself and the passive basis gains a portion of that.

The activity of the Ego is protentionally directed, into future, immediately and in complicated designs with acts to be performed in future. If now a fulfillment had emerged then properly speaking the “former” act is fulfilled, although it is still vivid in the mode Keeping. The sense of fulfilling is by way of synthesis dedicated to the “sunken” act of the “past” intention, and is kept by it. The process of fulfilling does not need to proceed continuously as a unity of an act for example. What actions else may ever come between intention and fulfilling, the fulfilling enters the past intention, i.e. the synthesis creates <a connection> between the “past” intention (that which is included in retention and thus always furthermore belongs to the streaming present) and the “later” fulfilling, a lasting synthesis has been created, that is, the series and chain of acts, in the activity unifying by way of active keeping.

If a former present is uncovered, if I am in the performance of the activity belonging to it, in the “Again”, then “I am again” the I striving into future, creating in an uncertain way, etc. But at the same time I am the Ego already living the fulfillment, having actualized the plan, I am the one now, I do not have it in current recollection, but it is encompassed in the retentional horizon, in the actual retentional covering now belonging to my current present. It is the retention of the fulfilling Ego act therein, which is not a keeping in the sense of keeping-in-one’s grip, but still a changed and covered Ego mode, synthetically related to the other retentional act mode, that of the “former” intention, so that this one is no more a mere intention, but a mere intention in one with “later” fulfillment “having become” as its own. Or former past belongs to former present, with the sense accrued to it from “later” present: having become future thus and thus.

If a past present is awakened for me now, if I <am> now active in it in the mode “Again”, then my doing has not merely the mode Again, since it un-covers a respective retention. What motivates my continued further doing, why is it not a being delivered of the reproduction along retention, basically a passive letting-oneself-go? Why do I go for stretches and then over dark stretches with seven-league boots towards new memories, etc.? My interest from the current [269] Now and from its having-an-impact awakens the former Ego-interest (for example according to similarity: “How did I help myself back then?”); and from there the interest goes towards the “former” fulfillment in the future that has become, following the synthesis already in the covering lying within the present horizon. I am the identical Ego and always a current self in this constant synthesis, constantly becoming new in the streaming, enlarging itself, [synthesis] of all my acts lying within the concrete streaming vivid present, the acts in all patent and latent modes, I in the patence, in the wakefulness, in the originally actualizing acts and their own modes of the awakened actuality, centered around the respective primal mode of the being-primarily-directed-towards-something-in-an-awakened-way, primarily towards something.

The[[9]](#footnote-9) primal streaming is a constant primal constituting; the “stream of consciousness” is constituted therein in its primal temporality. Certainly this is to be understood: it is a pre-time, which is not yet a form of objects for the Ego living in this stream of consciousness, not given “in advance” by it as a temporal stream, which means, an objective continuous succession, as that not experienced and experienceable – although to be demonstrated by the phenomenologizing Ego in the inquiry back in a peculiar abstraction and an identification only to be produced from it, which produces an objectivity afterwards. It is unexperienceable as a pre-being, unspeakable; as soon as the unspeakable, or rather, unexperienceable is demonstrated, that is, is experienced and becomes a theme of a statement, it is simply ontified.

The stream of consciousness (in this way lie a temporal stream has a meaning afterwards) is in itself a time, objective time constituting one. The Ego, active in an awakened way in the “stream of consciousness”, is thereby temporalizing something being in an objective way; <it> acquires them, acquires due to association in “transference” of new objects, as if it had primarily acquired them, gains objects in object fields as such ones of similar objects, in open object horizons, acquires by way of the repeatable and identifiable objective experience in the certainty of being, but modalizable, correctable, etc.

All these activities proceed within the stream, retentionalizing therein, but their acquisitions remain in the standing concrete present for the standing Ego, available for the creation of new acquisitions as “material”, their objective sense in the form of an experience proceeding afterwards, re-building on that of old experience and formerly acquired sense [270] and enlarging it, changing, and identified thereby and the like. There is always a bridging the continuum of retentionalizing of the momentary concrete present (and at the same time protentionalizing) streamingly extending by way of passive association and the egoical syntheses and their proceeding combinations, on the one hand within the covering belonging to the retentionalizing. In the constant wakefulness with the patent acts: constantly the “perceptual field”, the present awake sphere with the objects experienced in a wakeful way, apprehended and background ones. But this patent experience means: If the Ego is within the acquiring, where it has already acquired, then the hyletic is as a primal material not as conscious any more as formerly, as if the Ego was no longer the I of the undiscovered instinct and first pre-process of discovering. That which has already been acquired takes part in its retentionality. At first by way of combining active keepings in the concrete present and the I standing within (synthesis of the keepings in the way of a proceeding conjoint acceptance for the I, as an acceptance in one being now “vividly”-present). In the change of kinestheses a first functioning of the retentionalizing, “disappearing” from the primal impressional present, “return” of that which has disappeared in respective turn back of the kinesthesis; that which “has disappeared”, which is kept vivid, “returns”, i.e., it is recognized as the same in the repetition of the kesthesis. How is that? First “repetition” and then transferring repetition in the co-existence, etc.

(The New has something “similar” in the retentional, with which it is associated, and in this “coincidence” coincides also that, which I have “thereby achieved in an active way” as something better and best, it is put down on it, or my turning to the current thing already includes the change of my doing and my result, changed towards the wish, towards intention, possibly having an impact without restriction as a doing. That which has been priorily done instinctively, within the instinctive following a line of the better and making a satisfied halt at the best, having it in an enjoying way, that becomes the discovered intention afterwards, i.e. towards the striving to some best thing, towards the “conscious” striving, that which is now in a changed way transferred of the former doing is the goal thereby. But we now have the intention and its normally-having-an-impact and in the retention the retentional former same, an “external of each other”. But we do not have implied a second mere same in the present thing, but the former thing in the intentional modification of the former: Experience in the recognition.)[[10]](#footnote-10) [271] First of all there is no individuation made understandable, but only recognition and a furthermore repeated recognition, which itself enters into retention (as a recognizing and its repetition, as well the doing of the “I-repeat-the-same”, the same result, the same good acquisition in the repeated doing).

But I also do and acquire something else and in a repeating way. Here two things cross. How do I arrive at a multiplicity, at this one being accepted by me together showing some connection, at a co-existence of something simultaneous, but also successive?

Simultaneous pairing and already transmission in the awake present, then pairing in the retentionality (the higher one), the phases of which are an awake present, and then distant coincidences and transmissions (going) crosswise. Recognizing now has this manifold relation to retentionality and its simultaneities.

We have something different, similar and same in the at-the-same-time and from there in the after-one-another, eventually so to say co-existences, but as a simultaneous co-existence persisting in itself temporalizing itself within the awake streaming present as succession of something being-in-itself, which always only becomes known, but <is> something recognized within the type. And everything in the change of details in themselves still as a “spatio-temporal” world – form of the spatio-temporality, form of causality – as the used persisting style.

First of all something being must be constituted as something-being-in-itself, for a recognition as the same or cognizing as not the same in the normal logical sense being possible, and for recollection having the sense <of> recollecting “individually the same” (whether something physical now or something psychic, or men and humanities), an individual being must be constituted as a being-in-itself. Still more generally: It is the constitution of this and that as a being-in-itself entering the sphere of perception, that of the current present of something being-in-itself, as e.g. the sentence of the angle sum as “experienced” now originally, discerned in original activity or in recollection as a repetition of the “former” proving apprehension, “the” sentence, the one I remember, etc.

Every being stands within time (the co-existence-succession-time) as a form of the being in its being all. Everything being-in-itself (the being in the actual sense) is something being of the world. The individually being in the world of individuals, of the realities with the ontological structure belonging to it. Every ideal being has its allness of being, and thereby the totality of all [272] ideal is not a world next to a real world at all, but is founded in it, so that <the> universe of the being-as-such is something encompassing the real and ideal of every sense. But one should not imagine the ideal as a second genre of realities, as something basically similar, only founded, merely <as> that, which “formally” belongs to the in-itself as such, being purely logical-ontological, encompassing all being (real and ideal). But together with this the problem of the founding of the ideal as a logical acceptance-of, etc. comes up.

No.63

<The instinctive striving for fulfillment in the kinestheses, in the “enjoying” and in the interest>

Instinctive doing (kinesthesis) and a process of increasing the interest, of the being present and increasing in the change of similarity in the “enjoying”; increase of value through a change of similarity, in rigid association of similarity through the retentional continuity, under constant apprehending and keeping I, that is, unity simply of an act, directed towards A. The kinesthesis, proceeding, makes that which is won become something disappeared which is kept, whereas there is a new A’, A’’, instinctively “interesting”, affecting (that which would go instinctively towards such increases of value).[[11]](#footnote-11)

But the primary interest still remains with A, which is retentionally conscious as the end of the retentionally changed act of the gaining value. This keeping is an intentionally changed mode of the former act in the mode of the being-at-an-end and having (enjoying) (apart from that of course proceeding of the keeping implied in the act itself in its course of fulfillment). The act, going over into this keeping, is still continuously the same act in a changed mode. The “enjoying” having is changed into dissatisfaction, more closely, into an emotional emptiness, into a “missing” of the “lost” (expressions meaning something more though than may be meant here). The original instinctive striving, streaming away in kinestheses, is immediately directed towards such a fulfillment in a general-undetermined way (it is not yet conscious at this point that it runs on through this, namely can only achieve a relative end satisfaction, having become sensible and [273] patent). Thus the “missing” is “missing something I constantly aim at”. This can only mean: The end of the fulfillment was no “satisfaction”, no change into a becoming “interestless”, by the affective stimuli of the other data becoming effective soon (data in the field, the field unitarily in the distinction of data, in the unity of an emotional consciousness-of – mode prior to the turning to, prior to a feeling being-with, having and a better and worse having in the doing – distinction of that which is remarkable as a pre-emotion of that which immediately brings the instinct now into fulfillment -, these are necessary considerations of the beginning).

If that which is apprehended becomes uninteresting, then the intention turns towards increase even more, but the other one is, as affecting, although it is not apprehended, already there and it deviates the interest. Therefore the act does not proceed any more through its mode of keeping. This changes, the I is not within it as a supposing one directed towards “bringing closer”. As long as it is not indifferently interested in that which has disappeared, is the instinctive striving directed towards fulfillment. The Where-to was in the original course of action of “amendment”, and “for the first time” the discovering of the instinctive Where-to is implied in this course, in continuous intentionality. Every phase of the better is a discovering, but at the same time an un-fulfillment, transition of the proceeding instinctive intention. If this fulfillment-discovering is broken through disappearing, then the intention proceeds continuously in the change: as a wish for the “end” which has disappeared, and possibly is fulfilled in the form of regaining, that is, necessarily as an end of a new process, increasingly leading towards it and then to be continued beyond the enjoying. We have a primal mode of repetition as a having again in such a fulfillment – of the lost, still intended, but no more possessed – in the unity of an act. The repetition fails, or I get into a back and forth of the kinestheses, in which the repetition succeeds at last, is lost again, once more succeeds. Now the distinction of the repeating stretches and their directions accrues in the association of the kinestheses’ continuity; in the given case, in which a date is a thematic beginning, constitution of that which belongs together of certain kinestheses and new beginning, having again of the date, from which the optimum is to be reached with the corresponding, continuing kinesthesis. “The connection between kinesthesis and field <is> innate, to be mastered by training.

But to make all this clear and to arrive at the constitution of that availability and identification, or rather <at the> multiple recognition, in which a constant perceptual field of lastingly being and [274] changeable, mobile, spatiotemporal individuals has emerged, and then on beyond primordiality a world, that is quite a long way.

At first for simultaneous co-existence recognition under transmission: I lose what I have, but I gain another similar one. It proceeds into its optimum. I have lost and still keep it, missing it, but at the same time something new becomes affective in an effective way, it pushes forward and is apperceived in a similarly active way. The transmission, a modification of the repetition, as if I regain, re-having in the As-if. The original affection instinctively, the current field affection already apperceptively anticipating an activity aiming in a performing way. Discovered instinct in different modes. Acquired possession – realm of the having. Te “acquiring” = ability to ever again enjoy it (by recognizing it as the same), to bring it to the self-there, then to use it beyond that for new intentions. Realm of the not only originally acquired itself, but as having it as analogous, as recognizable, as available at hand.

No. 64

<On the fantasy-I and the recognition>[[12]](#footnote-12)

The[[13]](#footnote-13) inquiry back starts from the world, as an already pre-given time world, and this necessarily becomes eventually an inquiry back for genesis. It is important that <the> genetic is characterized elementarily as a recognition, etc. and its clarification is the main theme here.

Temporalization[[14]](#footnote-14) – that is the constitution of something being in time modalities. Something being, currently being with a past of the same being, future being of the same. Thus in the original sense something being = an original concrete present. It is a lasting present, “encompassing” past and future as dependent components in the streaming of the present. A concrete being can cease, and a past being [275] means a past concrete present, <correspondingly> future concrete present. How is the being constituted in the field of co-existing being and in the field of succession as that of the partially co-present being things, partially being one after the other, one after the other in past and one after the other in the will-be? How is the temporal order of original and modified present <constituted> and the condition of the durations partially coinciding, partially overlapping?

<a) The connection between the fantasy-I and the actual I in its temporal horizons>

I[[15]](#footnote-15) have my de facto perceptual field in the fact, my de facto past and future horizon, my de facto horizon of my trusted friends, parents, co-subjects as such and the common de facto surrounding world with its openness, under openness of the corresponding co-subjects. It is part of the fact that I can remember, recognize, empathize, etc., and that I am bound therein in my acceptances of being, as the I, the one I simply am, the one I am, that is, subject of my past and of my past world, co-determined in my empathies by my generative friends. If I fantasize something in a different way what happens thus to my horizons there? Can I fantasize myself differently in pieces, am I not an absolute concrete thing, which is and may only be concrete? As soon as I fantasize anything in a different way, the I as such is fantasized in a different way. But certainly there is some difficulty. Am I then completely fantasized in a different way? I am only partially fantasized in a different way. My respective horizon is a questionable potentiality. What about the horizon belonging to fiction? I, the I now fantasized in a different way, have a changed past as that – within the As-if. But may I question it, and how? I do not find a quite distinct past as the being one of the being present[[16]](#footnote-16) if I find myself in a fictive landscape in a fantasizing way, investigating my sense as an I within fiction on my past as an actual I, only all that within the “As-if”. Rather: I, the fantasizing one, although now sunken and lost in fiction, am still necessarily there as well. My “self-consciousness” as an actual I is only “covered”, simply through the self-consciousness as a fantasized I, a [276] fantasized self-consciousness. If I really live in the present, in the one being immediately current for me as perceptual field, then its being sense exactly implies as a present part “from the world” (that which is now perceptually given “of” it to me) simply that which makes worldliness, now completely “covered”, the horizon having its ways of explicability, its ways of discovering through synthetic connections of intuitive being acceptances. This implies my whole past with its past fields of perception and horizons, but also within the horizons the other ones and their horizons, furthermore my current future as well (in the discovered past likewise my respective former one), as being accepted by me now, and accounting on those in future meeting me. If I discover this future horizon, then it is obviously of a quite different kind than that of the past (with regard to that which has been in it perceptually and in certain special being acceptances). With regard to the future as that, which I will have perceptually, as a future activity of that, which will emerge-as-present, I am bound at the same time and free. The “picture” of a future subjective present has a “predelineation”, and this simply <forms> the frame for free options; I have a range of that which will possibly come, but in a disjunctive way, anything of it, this is certain. There is freedom within a general binding and therefore not a totally free fantasy, called free as an unbound one.

This is the case for every unperceived, but meant along present, as far as it has moments of unknownness and thereby of range-like openness; and in a new way of course empathy, the open and unknown of the other I as well as the respective horizons of future and co-present within my past.[[17]](#footnote-17)

[277] Let us return to the issue of the fantasy horizon of the I in fantasy, in which something worldly present, and thereby concretely a worldly present, begins and that which belongs to its apperception is initially predelineated in a determined way: these are close-distant-appearances, having a sense of appearance with relation to the kinestheses as abilities to change them, so that the distant thing can be brought close. The kinestheses are already bodily apprehended, the field is a thing field in orientation around the body as perceptual body and practical body, as center of affection and action. The fantasy field in its quasi-acceptance as beginning of fantasy (eventually like every beginning) covers – here it covers the serious-field of the respective perceptual present or memorial present. On the other hand the fantasy field has a further horizon zone and eventually as horizon that which the fantasy-I would concretely do as an I. But now we pay attention to the essential contrast of ways the actual I and the fantasy-I have a horizon consciousness.

That which makes the horizon for my serious I in the given case of apperception, is implied in my actual self-consciousness; and if we take the respective total apperception this results in its total horizon in one with it itself, my concrete respective total consciousness, that is, all encompassing, although implicitly, which I myself, the way I am I am, now lies explicably within me. If now my serious I as the I who I am constantly presents in this way the universal pre-givenness for all that is given [278] and implicitly meant along, the fantasy-I is quite different, which as a fantasied one cannot be concretely given and pregiven in principal, but always only given afterwards as posited along in an empty way from the beginning of fantasy, but in a row, which I can only fulfill through free, though not completely free fiction.

My fantasy world with the fantasy I is also my constitutive formation of acceptance within my lostness in fantasy, my fantasy world with my, the actual I’s, fictive I. I in the stream of my original being, living in respective activity, directed in it towards my goal, dedicated to it, although here to the supposed formations of fantasy. This is even not different in that case where I am reflectively directed towards myself, primarily or secondarily. I as eventually functioning (like reflecting) am thereby as well in original self-forgetfulness, am in the mode simply of the being-dedicated-to-the-aiming-whole. The activity “changed” as fantasy in the mode as-if belongs to this. Changed apperception with a changed, primary horizon and in the change the potentiality, the fantasy-I belongs to the change in ever new suppositions to be able to univocally build in ever new surrounding worlds – to a univocally to be fantasied one. I am bound in the primary horizon through special pre-delineations, which already are frames for free fictions as fillings. To a much higher degree this is the case for the open past and future, but also for the whole open co-present and the other men to be positioned and fantasied in open endlessness – gaining a strict sense only as co-humanity through fiction.

I am within that which is peculiar to me – I am concrete in my originally streaming being, and the whole of the explicit and implicit acceptances belongs to this, which are put down as past and have their horizon of the streaming’s and making-accepted-in-future’s futureness, and on top of that the acceptance of being through the connection. I, the transcendentally living one, <am> transcendentally living into my future, but being in a concrete way, and ready, the one I am in my having-becomenness and all its according to acceptance intentionally posited, the way it is, in its horizonlike indeterminacies and the intentional into-each-other of the horizons. But now my possible free fantasizing of world belongs to this, flying over for me de facto the world actuality and my worldly existence (and again mine, the transcendental having constituted and constituting), performance through fiction, letting-sink, and this itself is iterable. But fantasy plays a constant, constitutive role already on the steps of [279] the serious life and serious worldliness in all apperceptive horizons: co-present, future, empathy, that is, everything belonging to the constitution of the world for all.

Thus fantasy, activity of the taking over in the acceptance form of the as-if, as a constant function of world constitution, as a constant function in order to be able to gain apperceptive horizons, possibilities in future, also possibilities in the being-different. In all this: I in my possibilities; always encompassed therein: abilities. I <am> in my originality a standingly streaming “passivity” of absolutely invariable structure; it <is> also invariable that I am constantly I of affectivity, activity, “imagining”, “feeling”, “wishing” I, in one with the originality of the concrete streaming temporalizing and temporality, and thus, that a current present is always temporalized (my impressional, my being-now, my now actually performed activity), with my horizon of past and horizon of future. But time modalities have their genetic constitution on the way towards world-time constitution. With regard to the originality we need to differ of course the originality of mine, the one inquiring back from the constituted world, of mine, the mature I investigating sense, and the originality from further inquiry back, the originality of the “beginning” of constitutive genesis reconstructed by way of the discovering of genesis.

My hidden past, past in the dark horizon. Act life, actively being directed – into future, the Whereto is something future. Being actively directed towards something perceived is constantly being-directed towards something primal impressionally future in the mode of fulfillment. Towards background-present: to follow the affection and being there in future in an explicating way, to be directed towards something past.

Being affected by something awakened: Being-directed towards coming repetition, as a memory, then towards a repeated present as a constantly coming fulfillment in repetition. Being directed towards future, future as horizon, showing its sense in the pre-presentiation, that is, as if it were a memory, a repetition of a constantly happening present.

[280]

<b) The difference between repetition of perception as moment of every recollection and repeated perception, waking up a memory through recognizing>

Simple present – a sound, at the time of which I am always perceiving. One after the other: A sounding, a unity as such ends, and something else begins and ends, another sound, a bang, a noise, then again another one.

I have kept that which “has past” while given to the new. My single activities of perceiving are not separated, without context. I am continuously active in a unity of perceiving, and I am still active in a modified way as keeping within the activity of new perceiving. In the activity of recollection: repeating activity of the first sound, of the second, etc. But is the activity of the perceiving one-after-another only “repeated” like a new perceiving one-after-the-other? After my originally having actually perceived not only my retentional acquisition, that is, as actively my own, [my] just acquired having, and as that has sunken retentionally. The single activities are unified by the egoical retentionality, the first, that of the still-having, of the keeping without a proper activity. But something kept in such a way then again sinks from the grip. In contrast to that, unity of an interest results in keeping as a firm keeping and with the new keeping-in-one – at first in a collective way, but this is only the form for the continuously guiding “directions” of the I – instinct. Thus the unified activity has, although it was directed singly towards one sound respectively, created a unified active acquisition: a successive multiplicity (configuration).

If the first sound becomes affective as an acquired one and active as a repeating memory, then the multiplicity becomes affective, and the repeating activity strives away. The remembering repetition is directed towards future in another way than the original primal giving of a multiplicity, of the tonal succession: at the single sound <we are> not merely directed towards its continuous present fulfillment in the unity of interest for this configuration, but directed towards the whole succession as to be again presentiated in the repetition of the sound; the I in being directed has at least gone away, has the whole succession as a horizon of expectancy, as an anticipated succession of coming memories. Is this not the originally instituting constitution of a future in the common sense, as anticipation of something [281] manifold unitary “from afar”, of a coming close being in distant future? Thus, future needs to be constituted as such, thus time modalities as such.

If we now imagine the perception of the respective row of sounds (the same) was repeated in the common sense for a second time.[[18]](#footnote-18) I perceive the first sound actively. But I am still the owner of my acquisitions, and “I already know” this sound, I have already acquired it. I necessarily recognize it. The sunken acquisition surfaces in constant “coincidence” with the newly perceived in its course of the repeating activity. Coincidence is *eo ipso* covering, unity of something coinciding and covering: that is a primal mode of the intentional. Constant covering is thus the being one in the consciousness, that something coinciding has some covered thing. The coinciding itself is intuitive, the covered covered – to be made intuited.

Here it is the following way: a second perceiving of the same is in itself a “repeating” perceiving, or is, taken in a concrete way, at the same time perceiving and remembering, fused as coinciding. Recognition is in the form of perceiving, as fused to it, a mode of remembering (of “repeating”). And accordingly we do not simply have the first sound in re-perception here, in recognition, but the anticipation of the whole former, unitarily interesting, as multiplicity unitarily constituted series of sounds, pre-expectation of a distant future. Thereby the protentional horizons of the new perception und of the covered one cover each other thereby.

When the second sound emerges, then it emerges in fulfilling of this expectation. And now we need to consider that the configuration itself is effective, as a whole, which for its part predelineates – the expectation has its degree itself; the more the fulfilling proceeds, the stronger the expectation.

On the other hand though we need to accept that the repeating perception still again differs from the merely remembering repetition by the fact that the expected future does not need to come about; the expectation is then deceived, something else happens.

[282]

<c) Recognition as primal function of temporalization (past and future) in the instinctive life>

The awakening of the memory – primary, original activity, directed towards primal impressional present, towards the first-original present – constantly directed towards the present as originally coming, something new breaking in, but already breaking up that, which has just now stopped, “disappointment”, rather, break of the continuous fulfilling of the preview of that which is coming, but on the other hand a change of affection. It goes on, but I am interested in something else, I do not listen any more to the sound, I am affected by and interested in a visual date. Act live of the I unified in the I; Sinking as disappearing of the passive formation of unity and unity, egoical keeping – mode of the still-keeping, but not in grasping the new thing and thematic occupation with that which I kept as a theme, of the thematically binding, of the counting-amongst, of the collecting. But also a connection in a non-collecting combination. The I in life always already has a future horizon, insofar as a series of acts, manifold activity is predelineated as a distant future. What remains is that predelineation of any future is determined from the original present <and> from the acquired past. I am not merely as an I of the impressional passively-active present in my concretely-original present being, but the owner of my whole acquired past in its streaming being enriching itself from the impressional present. The new thing of the beingly-coming constant present and the new formation of thematic successions and collections, is in “coincidence” with the awakened similar past, from which motives ever.

The activity is not only a new activity in the coincidence, but at the same time in one “remembering” repetition of the former activity. We do not need to see a parallel remembering activity in this remembering repetition, only somehow “covered”, as if it would actually and explicitly proceed in its lines, that is, as a common memory, which as an original shape of presentiation simply brings something past, a past impression (not impressionally present) to self-givenness. But now impressional present, namely in recognition, becomes conscious as repetition of something past, but not itself currently presentiated. The present activity with its current content is conscious in itself as a similarization, as repetition. The respective retention is “awakened” in the retentional stream, the new [283] activity is unified with that [stream] <of the> respective awakened retention and is itself its repeating actualization, as the common memorial intuition is otherwise. The repeating actualization has its futureness, but differently to the non-repeating one. Not an abstract retentional phase is awakened, but the whole act, or rather, acquisition, and then furthermore the whole act context and its whole acquisition.

But there we falter. Is there no danger to skip the important thing? Is the acquisition not only an acquired acquisition from repetition, from recognition, from having again and be able to have again, and to be thereby able to come back in a remembering way, <that is to> “the same”, and then to go there again <from there>, to be able to re-actualize impressionally? Thus for the constitution of a persisting present as having, actually being for me now. On the other hand constitution of a past as a past having.

Meanwhile, original recognition cannot be already recognition of something “being” in the genesis, as of course original retention precedes the retention and recollection of something being, or rather, the retention retentionally changing the perception of objects.

The essential thing of the above considered remains, even if the original acts are not yet directed towards something being, hat <it> rather springs as something being for the I in certain acquirings. By something similar of the impressional present “similarizing” with something similar to the retention, the present gains an expected “similar” future.

The patent I of the present, the “currently” present one in the actually being active, gains community with itself by recognizing, coinciding unity with itself as the same I, act-I, and thereby a future horizon; as the same it will do the same.

If one says that in the original beginning the I in the instinct is within an empty horizon, then it is a repetition through which the discovering of the instinct happens. In the new but same striving, from a similar emotion of “insufficiency”, the goal of striving, and as a goal of a similar way of fulfilling, will be made patent.

We will have to say that repetition as recognition is the most original and recollection is already something secondary. But how does this come about? Repetition as recognition – as cognizing-something-similar-in-the-similar. But different things can take place there.

Let us consider: When talking of acts, then the I, be it initially within the dark instinct, is directed towards something, to reach it, to be satisfied within it. Primal satisfaction of the instinctive desiring, striving is [284] to be seen as the primal act of the impressional perception. The “hunger” precedes, it goes over into satisfaction, and that is a whole of the I-activity. What now, if the hunger is repeated?

Now we have the recognition and the future horizon with the satisfying fulfilling; the similar striving in the mode of repetition has a goal of fulfilling on the way of fulfilling from the past fulfillment taken over as similarization. When an actual fulfillment happens, then it is an impressionally recognized one, but similarizing in the impressional. This implies that it is something new, not absolutely the same. The anticipated similar thing at first had its content of a merely retentional and awakened past not functioning itself as a goal but as similarization of the goal. The similarity leaves open a consciousness for difference. Coincidence under difference and likewise within the fulfillment. This will be effective as well. If the striving in active fulfillment is from awakening, then consciously something similar is strived at, showing itself only in fulfillment – in coincidence with the consciously different similar thing.

If now the “hunger”, already resting on repetition, is often fulfilled, even periodically? One could ask here: The already recognized is repeated, is the recognized as such thereby recognized? The hunger is directed towards a meal, not towards something recognized as such. If all former cases are awakened one could ask further. Obviously there is a difference between recognition, explicitly thus: I have this, this over there, already lived once, and recognition with the explicable sense: “this is long known to me”. Moreover one will notice that there are differences in the functioning awakening of the analogous former cases, that the cases are awakened in different strength, that if explication gains some differing, this has still a horizon of openness of other cases not having come to light. This results in further problems thus. Apart from that it is right that also the recognition, or rather, the recognized as such enters the retention, although this does not usually become a theme.

If now the striving is not able to go beyond the status of the beginning of being hungry, restricted in the course of aiming, if the hunger increases in the unfulfilledness towards ever more fervent desire, does this not motivate a sinking back into past, and into the intuitive recollection of hunger, <into> fulfillment in the increasing and satisfying joy, so that now blissful past and blissless present drift apart? We do not reach far obviously. It is still not to be seen, how past shall become a field of free disposal and a [285] dimension of being. Is it not the bigger difference countering the fusion in recognition? First of all, how is a present constituted like the one of spatial co-existence in which I can likewise actualize the one as the other, in direct actualization, as directly, continuously accessible many options of reachable goals and many possible ways towards every goal? Then widening through breaks for rest, sleep, etc., and on top of that the problems of connection with other ones.

If many similarities of past are effective, predelineating something which is everywhere a similar future thing, then this is predelineated in a range of many options as implied. Many kinds of ways can be indicated as well – at first ways in the recognition, implied as horizons of the way.

Motives of making the future intuitive – the way, in which ways, it shall become; looking back on analogous past: How did I make the similar?

How about the difference in the similarity and the difference of the ways determined by that? Future leads to past, and intuitive future is a change of the past, similarizing. It is an anticipation of a perceptual present as anticipation of actualization and through actualized present <a> becoming-past, it thus anticipates past as well. Future is future present, future past. Past is done, completely determined in complete re-actualization as a memory; this is a limit, and repetition of such an actualization has the limit of pure identity. This is the distinctness of the goal of remembering activity, the soul activity, which is *a priori* determined according to its future telos. The anticipation is generally undetermined in its expectation, but bound through a frame of similarity for its options. The actualization thus is actualization of a rangelike predelineated option.

These are always similarizations and similarizations of a different step. That which is definitely expected, that which is to be produced as something determined in the certainty of being is always still undetermined in a rangelike way. That which is completely vague, the vague empty horizons <are> predelineated in similarities of a higher grade and rangenesses. All that needs an infinitely more concise and deeper clarification.

Is anticipation a good expression? It too much suggests some equality with memories. We have a binding of position in the options, the similarizing ones and in the options positional to the similarization, simply in the frame of similarity; on the other hand we are not bound in the formation of [286] intuition qua option. We can thus talk of a mixture of fantasy (free creating) and binding position. Positing, acceptance is not free. Where I am free I have positing within the as-if, beginning in the consciousness to be able to begin otherwise.

Completely free from any binding, from any position, I am in “pure” fantasy. But this has the character of a higher-level modification, in which the universe of positions with all its ranges is put itself into the as-if of freedom. I have a free beginning for a universe with a completely free fantasy, to implicitly continue fantasizing the posited will consequently into infinity.

Covering[[19]](#footnote-19) and fusion; recognition, recollection, awakening, affection in the original impression: visual field and visual field of the one and other “eye”, both have the same form of “locality”, and places of “the same” locality are not an external-of-each-other in the same impressional present, not resulting in a pair. They “fuse” in the equality (close similarity) in equality of qualification; in discrete similarity covering under struggle, i.e. if the one is intuitively actual, then the other one is covered and vice versa, apart from the functions of the interest. The fusion can touch upon whole pieces of the field and only struggles at one point. The remembered sense field and the impressional one of the same sensibility, likewise two remembered ones of the same sensibility, they behave in the same way. Thus fusion and transgression can happen and alternate covering.

Continuous “covering” in the stream of retentionality? Why covering instead of retentional change? But what does discovering, awakening mean? Awakening of an actualizing, repeating activity by another activity in progress, actualizing, aiming. Discovering – re-beginning, re-becoming, re-changing-oneself-retentionally, re-being-awake. Discovering is something new in contrast to mere awakening. This is entering from current actualization in possible mediatenesses into the sedimented, a tendency to re-actualize, to repeat, leading back into the “sunken past”. And this were (as memory) “discovering” of one’s own sunken past. Another way of the re-becoming-actual of the same is the recognition as a re-actualization analogizinig itself, the experiencing in the consciousness of repetition of something formerly experienced.

One will have to say that the recognition is the primal form of awakening, of he re-living of one’s own past and presupposition of all mediate awakenings. If A is recognized, then the similarization of the past in the present is a mode, in which the first one awakens. But together with this in one is awakened that which is synthetically actively bound with it in the “former” activity. It affects as that, i.e. a tendency towards the act-I to “turn there” now, that is to enter repeating memory.
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