C2

No. 1

<The primal phenomenon of streaming as temporalization of persisting unities. Ego as anonymous primal pole of all temporalizations’ unity>[[1]](#footnote-2)

The[[2]](#footnote-3) surrounding world, the experienced world in which we are living, the world as it is for us constantly in original validity within the experiencing intuition in the awake life, that is, “there itself”, perceptually, is given to us in unchangeable necessity within a constant flow, always as itself, as the one and yet always given differently, in an unceasing change of subjective ways of givenness, of ways of appearance, a word marking vaguely many directions of change. The primal phenomenon in regard to the world experience, the world knowledge – included therein the primal phenomenon for each experience and cognition of single world objects – is the Heraclitean flow of a subjective having-a-world, of the subjectively pregiven belonging to the world, whether it moves or rests, however it changes or remains unchanged. But this as well belongs to the Heraclitean flow of having-a-world that this world, appearing as one and the same world in streaming ways of appearance, was streaming within itself; world within the “flow of time” keeping its spatiotemporal form within the constant flow of time modalities, changing itself as world of realities (of real substances), but within its changes preserving itself identically in the way of persevering.

The “primal phenomenon” of streaming is the phenomenon of all phenomena, of everything being for us in any sense, - since everything is within the primal phenomenal streaming as “giving itself” therein and in a widest sense in [2] streaming modes a unity persisting as the same. Even if we, more precisely: if I look upon the primal phenomenal streaming, then it is in a curious way itself related to itself as “that” within the primal phenomenal streaming.

We need to include in this primal phenomenon the constant face-to-face of “Ego” and the being-for-<the>-Ego-respectively. But this is not sufficiently characterized, insofar as it is not a reciprocal face-to-face. In any particular case “everything being for me” is given in a primal phenomenally streaming way – this being-for-me means: being currently there for me, being directed towards, opposite of me, but in such a way that <the> Ego, to which all that is opposite, is “anonymous”. It is not for its part “opposite” <the way> the house <is> opposite of me. And yet, I can direct myself towards myself.[[3]](#footnote-4) But then again the face-to-face is split, that in which the Ego emerges together with what had been opposite of it, that is, opposite of it the Ego emerging opposite and its opposite. Herein I, the “subject” of this new opposite, am “anonymous”.

That this is the way it is, I see by way of this same reflection[[4]](#footnote-5), with the performance of which I can at the same time find the Ego opposite of me, which had just been anonymous, together with its opposite. Thus reflecting and ever again reflecting I ever again find something being opposite and I find the same Ego within these reflections, find the ever-again of the reflecting and being-able-to-reflect itself as an opposite of the Ego, which is one and the same, however it might be set opposite and be reflected to the thereby anonymous Ego. I find an[[5]](#footnote-6) Ego within this constant splitting-itself of the Ego and the then-again-identifying-itself, which I call the primal pole, the originally functioning Ego, and the Ego having become the original Ego’s opposite, the being, and the circuit of that which is there as a non-Ego for this and for me as anonymous Ego, including the world external of me, within it other Egos, worldly as bodily governing, Egos, combined with natural bodies, with the physical bodies, and everything else belonging to the world, which is, but does not contain any Ego.

But if I thus reflect and find something manifold opposite of me as another Ego, I am still solely an Ego pure and simple, I, having and being capable of having each within themselves and everything, that is for me, within the opposite, the others as well, and that they can have each and everything opposite of themselves.

[3] Ego as functioning Ego shall precede all being-for-me and I am always functioning Ego, and only as a functioning one I find others as being ones within functioning, indirectly from my functioning. I am the only one. Whatever is for me, is my own due to the unicity in which I function.

But whatever is for me, is as unity within the primal phenomenal flow of my functioning life; and I myself find again each pulse of this life, as soon as I have it as being within the “opposite” (am directed towards it) as unity, as remaining within the flowing and remaining, while its ways of appearance, its subjective modes, in which it presents itself to me, <or rather> appears, change. Each and everything is a unity within streaming, but on different levels, in such a way itself, that the as a change being for me itself is given within the streaming of ways of appearance as the same change, the same appearing thus and thus, and likewise unchanging is given (e.g. that of a constantly remaining physical object qualitatively remaining completely unchanged) is given to me within the streaming of its ways of appearance, that is, within a change, within a changing-itself (in a totally different sense). Every being for me is for me experienced and experienceable in its corresponding streaming. This streaming is its temporalization, and as something temporalized every being, persisting within the streaming of its modes of givenness, has its way of being temporal, its temporal form and its temporal content, and with regard to the temporal form its streaming time modalities.

I am – I live, and my life is an unbroken unity of the originally streaming temporalization containing all manifold temporalizations. Thus an unbroken temporalization encompasses all <temporalizations> being for me, which are thus all related to me and united in this regard. All their differentiations, all their succession and outside-of-each-other, and in what temporal sense ever, are encompassed within me, insofar as that which is being for me is nothing but a “unity of appearance”, as <unity> of appearing, manifold moments of life united within the primal phenomenal flow.

Ego – that is that which at first only the primal pole of “its” life does say, of its primal flow, in which all unities, called being ones, present themselves as persisting unities.

[4]

No.2

<Necessary steps of the time- and world constitution>

The[[6]](#footnote-7) primal flow of the living present is the primal temporalization, which implies the last origin of the spatiotemporal world and of its form of spatiotemporality. Insofar as it is shown that temporalization and time, and thereby being objectivity, being world, have different steps on each of which we can in a special sense speak of being as a temporally being, of a universe of being as “world” and of time itself, we need to say: times, objects, worlds of any sense ultimately have their origin in the primal streaming of the living present – or, rather, within the transcendental primal-Ego, living its primal life as a presentation and present flowing in a primal way, and thus has a being in its own way, being within a primal temporalization constituting a primal time and <a> primal world within the flowing.

All these concepts including the terms temporalization, time, world, thereby object as well, are, wherever they are not used in a mundane way, of a sense only emerging from the transcendental-reductive method being trained in necessary consequence, which therefore is foreign to natural language. Of course the change of sense, or rather the enlargement of sense, rests upon essential differentiations and commonalities. Still this does not exclude the existence of an essential difference with regard to the times and worlds of objects of these “steps” up to the time and world in the natural sense, that is, between the primal step, i.e. the original ground on which all higher steps are based, and these steps altogether.

In formal generality the talking of “steps” of the world’s constitution (included therein [the constitution] of the constitution of the objective time, of the space-time) means this, that is, considering the times and worlds constituted as steps: The constantly in a streaming way proceeding world experience of the transcendental Ego is a continuously accomplished acceptance of being of the sense world, of a sense in which world is respectively accepted by me as that of this experience. The respective special experience of these or those objects is an experience within the frame of total experience, they are experienced within the world horizon. This performance accomplished under the title of world experience – transcendental world experience – implies in concealment a series of steps of performances, on which the total performance (that by which world “is for me”) is based, that is, which must necessarily be executed, for this final performance [5] to come about. They are thus always comprised in it in a concrete way. Each has its sense and its acceptance of being, but within this connection of founding they do not have the mode of the ultimate validity, but simply of that serving in a founding way, immediately for the next higher step, mediately for the higher steps. (This secondary way of performing (in the mere pervasion) makes these acceptances of being and their sense-contents be “overlooked”. Every seeing as looking-towards-something has the mode of the ultimate validity. Thus a “static” analysis of validity is needed, analyzing the complete produced formation of the being sense (of the sense-content within the acceptance of being, of the being-for-me of this and that “content”) and in correlation the analysis of the experience performing the being-senses on every step and eventually as a whole (experiential step and total experience). This results in a first transcendental sense of “world history”, that of the static world constitution, a happening within the streaming of the world experience of a polymorph structure of happening, by the performance of which as a motivational performance the whole happening is for us, or the history of which lies within this foundational context of performing and performance and is discovered and explicated within the static phenomenology. But all this (that is the meaning of this “static”) before each question concerning a genesis, a history of the becoming of the world within the transcendental subjectivity and its transcendental temporality still unknown to us here.)

What we have said of the founding steps in formal generality encompasses, if we do not understand the describing concepts (especially the talk of “execution”, of “being accepted”) in a pregnant sense, the primal step as well. It denotes that being of the transcendental subjectivity with those structures (those of its what-contents), already presupposed to all constitution. But here the big difference is that all higher-level being-spheres and times stem from active sense-fashionings, that they come with their respective sense-content through active directing-themselves, taking-interest in, target-oriented acting from the Ego to their being sense as unities of acceptance, while activity as a whole and as such has its “presuppositions”, “conditions of its possibility”, that do not themselves stem from activity. This is what we need to differentiate: that which acts as sense-performances bring about in whatever act-combinations and act-foundings, whereby then the respective concluding act “includes” its sense as being accepted (being accepted by the active Ego), on the other side the streaming being of the acts themselves, of the unities of act-combination and act-founding themselves. The performing doing is being itself, apart from that which wins acceptance “therein” as [6] being and belongs to that being-context which is (at best) experienced, but is not the experiencing life itself and is not the therein experiencing Ego itself. Every act lies within the unitary flow of the transcendental life, therein a special moment streamingly streaming away. And this unitary life has its essential structure to which every particular life, including the acts, is bound. All transcendental questions, deriving from that concerning the transcendental sense of the world, obviously lead back eventually to the question concerning this essential structure, or rather, to this primal being or primal happening of the concretely living transcendental stream of consciousness and the Ego mentally living within, the Ego of all transcendental acts, of all transcendental performances.[[7]](#footnote-8)

No.3

>The primal phenomenon of the living present. Its essence as rigid form of a process in which the temporality of concrete individuals is being constituted>

The[[8]](#footnote-9) primal phenomenal concrete stream of present, the transcendental subjectivity within the primal form of its being, is primal streaming present, within the form of being of the streamingly streaming away still present and ever again present; a constant change and in just this way present constituting itself in continuity; as we are about to hear, “present” in an improper sense. Since its own sense as transcendental being within the primal form is not by any means in a common (although enlarged) sense a present as streamingly persisting link connecting a past and a future streaming along. Still the expression is unavoidable due to reasons that will soon be understood. We use the distinguishing expression concrete primal (“primal phenomenal”) present. It is indeed the “primal phenomenon” to which all transcendental inquiry back within the methodology of the phenomenological reduction leads back. Within it the perceptions occur – nay, in a certain sense it is itself within its totality and all its constituting parts (constituting its sense), in its respective prominent mental processes and moments of mental processes [7] perception. Since that which is actually really part of this total sphere, is conscious, that is, conscious in the mode of originality, and the same holds true for itself as totality. This does not mean: <It is> perceived in the sense of an activity, primarily or secondarily “paying attention to”, only directed towards the perceived. If I recur to this transcendental primal Ego of mine, to my transcendental primal present in a transcendental attitude, that is, in a theoretically interested and active way, then a transcendentally primal present process corresponds to this going back in a transcendentally reduced way, and this is closed by a transcendental act (within this primal present), in which, as being an attentively perceiving one, primal present is physical. But now one will object: present having become physical, perceived, having become the target (counter-pole) in general of an act directed towards it from an Ego-pole (and single mental processes of this primal phenomenal sphere having become) is physical within a consciousness, an act, which is itself not physically conscious. The thing in which we thus engage our attention as something eventually being, as a primal being under the title of primal phenomenal present, is exactly therefore not the ultimate thing, since it is a “phenomenon” for us. And again one could say: It is only by reflection that I know of my transcendental life. How can I speak at all of such a [life], of a primal present, which is not physical, which is pre-perceived? How can I speak of the primal phenomenal being, which, as soon as I do so, is conscious, and at the same time <say> that for the Ego, to which it is related as its “pole”, it is anonymous? How shall we understand this anonymity, and that of the Ego itself, which we display as a pole of the acts, and from there on as a pole also of the “intentional mental processes”, being non-acts? How do we arrive at “facultative capabilities” of the Ego thereby, and what it is itself? Anyway, how can we justify a method making us adopt this primal Ego, this primal phenomenal sphere, so that we can call it primal phenomenal in general? – All this is not a matter of beginning. The naively practiced method has to precede justification, self-understanding of the method, and even this, that it needs to be thus, must be made a matter of insight in retrospect. The method as well is of course a transcendental occurrence in its absolute being, and as that also belongs itself in the primal phenomenal, that is, the anonymous sphere.

The primal phenomenal being as a present streaming in a living way is originally conscious, is a field of original attentive perceiving, perceptions, according to everything composing it. It has an amazing structure to be followed in different directions, especially that characterizing it as a streaming one. [8] It is its basic character to constitute itself as a *nunc stans* of a unitary streaming through an anonymous continuity of a primal mode’s intentional modifications, which for its part is not a rigid [continuity], but streaming itself. A standing and remaining primal-now as rigid form is constituted within this streaming for a streaming through content and as primal source point of all constituted modifications. But together with the rigid form of the primal streaming the primal-now is constituted, a two-sided continuity of likewise rigid forms; thus a rigid continuum of the form is constituted within the whole, in which the primal-now is the originarily arising middle of two continua as branches of the variant modes: the continuum of that which has just been, and that of the future. But this is a standing and remaining continuity of form for that which is streaming through it, which is always constituted along as streaming through; and within the streaming through of this form there is an amazing synthesis in a continuously flowing process, in which the now emerging in an originarily arising way, constitutes itself as an individual being, which, going through the form-system of the just-now, always remains the same, but the same in continuously different modes of the just-now.

I pass over the question as to how about the constitution of the identity of that which will come in future being conscious within the concrete present: This essential structure is exactly analyzed under the title of the “phenomenology of the inner time-consciousness”.[[9]](#footnote-10) Or rather: it is the phenomenological constitution, which makes the being of the primal phenomenal present as such.

Thereby with the help of this analysis the concept of originality differentiates itself, that is, [the concept] of the perceptual way of givenness. We differ between the primal impressional way of givenness of that which emerges as a Now in an originarily arising way and the retentional and protentional [ways of givenness], and we differ at the same time between this primal impressional and these retentions and pretentions, or rather, this whole continuity in its streaming progress and that which is given therein originally; on the latter side the primal perceived in its primal perceived form of the primal-now, furthermore the still originally given of the retentions, that which has been just now, within its original form of the just-now, etc. belonging to it respectively. If all originally given was called perceived, then also that which has just been is perceived; or rather, it is perceived, that the individual, regarded abstractly in its punctuality, emerging within the point Now, is now, at once changed into the just-now [9] and within the change of this just-now into the just-now from the just-now and so on [it] persists as the same, as the same within the change of its time modalities. Exactly thereby it constitutes the same, but as an individual point, and differentiated from each point continuously constituting itself anew within the continuously streaming progress in the persisting form of primal-now and just-now, etc.

In this way of continuous synthesis a continuous lasting constitutes itself, in which each phase is an identical point of time an identical time-form constitutes itself with identical points of time as phases of this form and identical “concrete” unities, which are as individual unities within the form, do have their duration respectively, persisting in this form and being time-modal within its mode of givenness, constituting duration of time as persisting within the continuous change of the time modality. These time modalities as such and the time itself are originally given, including the time-duration itself of that which lasts, or rather, the lastingly being. But essentially unity can only constitute itself (and unity must essentially constitute itself) in such a way, that the whole content of the primal-now constitutes a majority of outstanding unities in a co-existent way, having respectively a way of their still developing within the stream of time modalities. As that continuity of the similarity must take place within the fulfilling content. Contentual conditions of the association must be fulfilled according to the co-existence and succession. Time and duration within time constitute themselves essentially within the streaming concrete primal present in the form of concrete individuals, co-existing and succeeding ones. Since this always must have been already constituted when we unfold the primal present, thus the question back must proceed from this as being the first for us.

No.4

The “primal phenomenon” – how do I come by it? <The living stream of the consciousness’ present becomes a primal phenomenon within the transcendental reduction, the primal field of experience for the transcendental phenomenology>

Reflection on me as the Ego of the world, which I am conscious about respectively as the one being accepted by me, as that in which I live in a human way; radical reflection is epoché – Ego as transcendental viewer of my<self> as common Ego, as human; conscious of the world and of myself, being within universal [10] experience, the view directed towards the life of consciousness, in which I have something worldly and world as such, in which especially I also have conscious my being as a human-personal subject, and the way I have it respectively.

I find myself “naturally” reflecting as an Ego (being a human person) related to the world and myself in perpetuity, that is within a stream of ways of consciousness, thereby within a streaming progress of ways of appearance and in changing modes of acceptance – therein life which I call psychic conscious life of the world, or life of imagination (with all my egoical ways of behavior), I find as a stream, always in this form stream or standing-streaming progress of present of “imaginations”, of having-a-consciousness, ways of acceptance, etc. standing-living stream. Concerning this I say: it is my constant psychic stream of consciousness, my <stream>, man’s <stream>, in which I am related to everything external to me and everything being accepted by me as worldly. As something psychic it has its psychophysical interlacing, etc. Thereto now all apperception related to me in my humanity belongs, the manifold ways of appearance, in which I present myself to me physically and psychically, the changing acceptances, changing judgments and evaluations, related to my human being-there and being-thus.

In transcendental epoché I encompass in one go my being and that of the world in all its however to be repeated apperceptions and acceptances and the universe of these natural acceptances I bracket in one. Instead of the world I now have the “world phenomenon”, and instead of the man and the psychic Ego [I have] its phenomena.

And now I have this phenomenon as a transcendental Ego, that is, as a streaming phenomenon, and for me as a phenomenological Ego this is – and in a phenomenologizing way – my primal phenomenon, my primal field of “experience”, and it shall be the ground for my judging cognition, for my phenomenology.

No. 5

<The recollection within the flowing present>

Question back[[10]](#footnote-11) of the pre-given world as [being] within the time-stream of the subjectively appearing world. [11] The first: The world is given to me as a present world, the present one as a present one of its (world-) past and world-future. Thus the world [is given] within the streaming of this whole modality present, past, future; identical world in identical time. But the world is originally a perceptible one, a world present in the way of givenness, that is, as appearing to me in my present; it is living (world-) present in a (conscious) streaming proceeding within ways of appearance, in which the present which has just been (therein again in continuous implication its having-just-been, etc.) is implied.

But this within the streaming. Thus we have a streaming total present. The streaming total present has different essentially possible forms. There has been no talking within the former description, thus abstracted from recollections and horizons of recollection and of all other representations as such.

The time of mental living: the present of mental living becomes the past; within the change of its being past, of its ever more sinking back into the past it remains the same at the same point of time. Likewise <it holds true> for the world time: each world present “passes”, but the point of time is identical within the change of being past; the being, the present being <is> thus a streaming limit for the series of time modalities <of> past, each of which is itself within the streaming away.

So much so that within this modal streaming <that> which is present now, remains identical, keeps an identical point of time within this identity, as a title of its individuality so to say – thus to talk this way means to interpret a future, that is, to perform an act within the streaming present, which constructs the past in a generating way as a coming one, a future one in a way of appearance, in which the generated is and can be identified iteratively through future recollections.

This happens within the streaming living present, thus [it happens] through recollection being performed in a freely doing way, that in the form of repetition a new recollection is performed, which the still modified living present (this recollection) within the having-just-been identifies with that of the new, livingly present recollection.

The living present has its total just-now (flowing continuity), but it has a Now, not containing any moments of the just-now, as little as future moments: it has a “primal impression”. Streaming present is amazingly unified, living temporalization, time modalities streaming from the primal impression [12] and therein time: the impressional Now, therein streaming and within the streaming one. But the streaming present is also present of the streaming and streaming away and streaming to. At the same time Now and the continuity of the been-nesses and the living protentional horizon are conscious – and this at-the-same-time is streaming at-the-same-time. But totally as present it carries in a streaming way a living retentional past and future within it, and at each moment of its total streaming one can speak of primal time. Change of time modalities and persisting within this change the unity of a time order of temporal happenings, having their lasting place and length in a firm order.

We also have here present, past, and future, we a “stream of consciousness” – but “living streaming present” is not a stream of consciousness. Within the livingly streaming present recollection of a present can emerge, and “I” can construct for me a unity of time as a time of mental processes, of acts, etc. Primal streaming into the dark – primal change of temporalization, origin of time in which is objectified world time. Because the primal streaming objectifies as a stream of man’s consciousness and with everything objectified therein and thus in an iterative way.

The primal change is, spoken in an absolute way, in no time, which first of all stems from it.

I say, now a recollection emerges, afterwards one can emerge, I can, within recollection, come back to the emergence of recollection, I identify the recollection through its time modalities and give it thus an identifiable point of time.

And again: I speak of this process of identifying within the primal living present; I overview the living present and its streaming, and by recollecting I go back to the sunken living present. I live through the recollection, and the past <present> as such sinks, I return to it, and so I have a unity of time before my eyes, in which living present [text: plural] streams, and within this streaming the streaming of time modalities of this time.

No. 6

Ego as a concrete theme. <My mundane self-understanding as a concrete Ego within the world. The primordial reduction and the rise of the constitution up to the common world>

I[[11]](#footnote-12), as the one having a world, my world being univocally accepted by me, accepted by me as a world of actual and possible experience, accepted by me with changing content of being things within my experiencing life, my life of world consciousness – I can overview my life, my experiencing having-a-world within the course of my life, and this life itself with all the meaning; there I find my appearances of perception, my recollections, etc., my possible experiences, my non-intuitive ways of consciousness, my plans, my directing myself, and having-<myself>-directed-in-a-recollecting-way, etc., my empathies as ways of having other ones. I find my ways how something worldly in its manifoldness is still the same for me, and the same as being within its time: in its present, that is, in its manifoldness belonging to my present, in its past presenting itself to me within my pasts, and is certain to me therein as a unity of selfness. But in so doing I also find, how this same is the same for the other men becoming conscious to me within my experiences; they become conscious to me in an experiencing way as persons through empathizing representations, being accepted by me thereby through experience and consciousness as being for themselves within their own life, having a world therein, and experiencing the same as I, etc.

I am then able to differentiate for me within this world being for me (as being for the empathized ones within my empathy and for their part as empathizing themselves, etc.) the primordially given to me and that primordially given to the other ones who profess themselves to me in an empathizing way – that, which everyone experiences primordially of the same world (everyone though of the other ones being accepted by me).

I err concerning the others’ being – but to my own life a content of others belongs at all lifetimes, [others] who are continuously accepted by me in univocality as being for me and likewise through all my life. Like I constantly have my being, and with all I am, thus I have [14] implied therein the other ones, that is, as communicating with me, although the other subjects’ being-for-me (as subjects, as implied ones) has a secondary character, and modalizations are in detail not only possible through the being thus, but through the being. And this being-for-me of my “we” from me and my constant acceptance of being is included therein or is given within my life of consciousness and my habituality. Everything being worldly for me is [worldly] in manifold ways of consciousness; each is for me as my mentally living, in which something worldly is mentally lived, in some mode of the way of acceptance and of appearance. As constantly being for me I am in constant certainty of my own being. As constantly being for being ones, or rather, in the certainty of the being of others being for me as being for themselves, and for whom I am in a certainty of being.

We need to differentiate the concrete whole Ego with all its current and habitual acceptances, to which also those belong it is supposed to have under the title of empathy, experience of something foreign, certainty of the co-being of others as mine [as my certainty]. Within my concrete being, within my concrete own temporal life, the others being for me are being for me as that and the way they are accepted by me.

On the other side I differentiate: Ego within primordial reduction, I abstract the other ones’ acceptances lying within the empathy (similar to my abstracting within my own sphere the acceptances of memory, making valid my past).[[12]](#footnote-13)

Then I have a primordial bodiliness, a primordial nature; foreign bodies then become my primordial bodies, becoming accepted as foreign bodies when the primordial abstraction is voided. The others’ co-acceptance means at the same time now, that this body in its primordiality is their only body, and is at the same time being for me – thus the common being sense of nature begins to show itself. It presupposes the others’ acceptance of being, motivated by the acceptance of being of my primordial nature – not being nature in the true sense.

Within my own being, in which I have every being for me as being accepted by me currently and habitually (also myself and my life, all that in which something ever being for me has become and is as unity of manifoldness, etc.), I find the way of motivation, in which world as a universe of objectivity gains for me the sense of this objectivity [15] and always has it.[[13]](#footnote-14) I find my primordial being within my primordial life, within my primordial ability to direct it, therein as primordial formation my constant body as my organ and as body within physical nature which is perceived and perceptible by my prevailing in a sensibly perceiving way, I myself constantly related to this bodiliness and through this to myself and to nature else as external nature; thereby as Ego which does not as nature but in another way “have” the manifoldness of sensuous appearances, is experienced as their unity nature, etc. And this “subjective”, by its implying nature as being accepted by me in the certainty of being within the univocally actual and possible operation of subjective ways of givenness, is the basis of motivation for the acceptance of being others have for me, or rather, the pre-objectively being body, I prevailing therein, external nature – but as a unity of my appearances – founds the acceptance of being foreign body, in which a foreign Ego prevails and [in which] foreign – namely his – unities of appearances are accepted as nature, and thereby for me “our nature”, in common to me and this other one being motivated for me.

Thereby that which is objective for us, namely common nature, grows for me in a motivated way, but my body as well not only as body in which I prevail, but “a” body for him as well (the other one whose being has become accepted by me), not his, but my body, in which “mine” though has the sense as within dialogue, namely Ego as his other one and at the same time as Ego for myself; thus I as prevailing within the body, and thereby within nature as within this nature – nature for both of us – constantly “unified” with this physical body the way he and his physical body is objective within this same nature; - I, a psychophysical man, he, a psychophysical man, man <as> the objective being accepted by both, for each one in his subjective way, for each one implying the other one through empathy in his own subjectivity.[[14]](#footnote-15)

The motivation does not leave by way of the gradual summation of new other ones, entering gradually my experiential circle, but only so far that apperception as “transference” of the already known can function in similar cases. The communalizing of the activity within <the> experiencing and acting is essential and the motivation of the mediateness of the others’ others within the and-so-forth. [16] If I investigate sense, I naturally always find myself as a man among men, and within a world external to men.[[15]](#footnote-16) All in all, I find the world as a universe of the objectively being, to which I and my fellow men belong, and in which every being for me and for everyone, every man, is the object of possible experience, for us all cognizable as the same, in mutual understanding, which is mutual enrichment in a true sense as well, and determinable in relative truth being appropriate in every special situation, like we men ourselves for each other. We are human subjects of the consciousness for the objective world and [we are] at the same time objects within it, and as that we find ourselves any time.

But if I say that and between ourselves, then I must not overlook that it is me in whom that what has been said has a sense of being, something meant, experienced and experienceable, understood or understandable, drawing sense and right from there alone. Included therein though, like the being of the world as such, thus the being of “us”, to whom and among whom I am talking here, while the talking itself together with the audience, by whom it is accepted as an address, is <that> which it is for me, as my acceptance of being, derived from my purely own inner motivation.

If I get clear about how I myself am as this Ego of all its acquisition of acceptance, of each and every being for me, and if I discover the ways of motivation lying purely within me, within this Me, and in which world as constantly being for me is nothing else than my constant motivator, then I cognize that this question concerning the Who does not signify the question concerning the human person, who is rather a motivator within the continuous, livingly functioning motivational connection of this primal subjectivity. I am myself this Who, and still not in the common sense, insofar as by saying Ego in this common sense I already speak of a final formation of my eventually functioning Ego, which in order to declare itself in general needs to be functioning already. The functioning and the functioning Ego though, while being the originally living one, is [sic] hidden, unthematic. It only becomes accessible through a quite peculiar reflection, by way of the original method of all philosophical methods, the transcendental reduction. [17]

No.7

(“I” thought through from living present.)

(a) The concrete Ego with its habitualities, interests, ideal goals, and its factuality)

Primal[[16]](#footnote-17) streaming life of my primal I-live. Primal mode of streamingly-living present as my apodeictic originality, therein primal-modal “I”, primal-modal activities, and primal-modal emergence of habitualities; within the streaming primal temporalization of unities not being unities of being yet. Mode deduced within the streaming: past streaming life (streaming past present), my past unities, affectivities, activities, past habitualities of the then originally having become [habitualities].

I, the now originally, primal-modally being in living present, am the same Ego of my pasts – I carry them as past life and past habitualities, Ego of the past, intentionally within my primal-modal present. Within the streaming I have a coming streaming. Within the I-am I have “before me” the I-will-be. I also carry my future within me as a horizon of possibilities in which I will be. But is only streaming past awake <past>, and only streaming future awake future?

I am streaming in having-a-world, in the having of a world being for me in a streaming way (within streamingly fulfilled temporality). I am worldly living, awake within the streaming, always apperceiving the world and myself as man within the world, etc., thus other men as living into the same world, apperception of world by way of repeating interpretation of the identical opinion, and by way of the corroboration. Streaming life in passivity and activity (awake Egoicalness) as streamingly carrying the same Ego (person) within itself. In a double way: the same Ego, which now has habitualities from active acquisition, now acquiring in a primal active way, but at the same time therein from former acquisitions implied within – it either remains faithful to itself, it is in egoical consequence within its active life, or not. The present primal-modal acceptance implies an inheritance of former acceptances. Activities of repetition: I can wake my past, and only thereby is [18] it for me as a past, and within the awakening and “repetition” emerges a corroborating confirmation and dispute. Ego within the tendency, within the striving for self-preservation, directed towards univocality with me – with regard to the past. But past and future are not separated.

Present Ego is directed towards future, and past <Ego> has been directed towards future previously. Each directing-oneself towards the past happens through an interest in future. It has always been thus. But I am the now and just now “actual” Ego. I am the Ego in a primal-modal way, having present interests being accepted within the Now, and [having] their unity now. This includes the “previously acquired” interests, “the former still being accepted by me”. Ego, now being the way I am, now directed towards future action, towards future acquisitions, future being, and from there awakening, serving activities of consideration and revaluation.

I am, I have a demonstrable past as my streaming “prior” life, the way it has been “indeed”, implied within me as explicable in primal ability. I am as an identical, persisting in my stream-temporality Ego of personal habitualities, of respective interests being and having been mine in succession, the horizon of future <interests> in front of me. But thus I am, now consequent, now inconsequent, I am now in the sense of the being-Ego, and active life the Ego, which, by my being constantly, “should” continuously be otherwise, eventually and totally with regard to that which has been and is my constant total telos, now in dispute with my “true” being- and living-“will”. I, the Ego of interests, which I truly am now, am in univocal covering of interests with my past Ego; I am insofar the same as I still accept my interests – personally persisting insofar identically persisting within my time, otherwise in the covering of dispute, the same in the modalization of his being-directed. I carry my unfortunate, untrue, contradictory existence, factuality within my current life – but also within me the idea of my true being, my should-be, and simply thereby the ideal ability of self-criticism, of criticizing this factuality, at each temporal point the ability and conceivability of the other ability of doing, which would have determined the whole further course of life in another way, if I had acted thus. (I – the active Ego of univocalities, relatively being in univocality and directed towards univocality.)

The being and life, in which Ego-being happens, comes to its being, and always having a being is a being directed towards being, the way that life [19] implies active life (within an inauthentic being correlative: life is directed towards a going-to-live). This being-directed as a continuous one comes to continuous fulfilling within the single one; all single goals are situated within horizons of possible goals, but unknown ones, undisclosed, but afterwards past possibilities become known, and those wished for are deleted, but to no last end. Each end, each fulfilling is a passage, correction and a new choice; but within this continuous “making-finite” lives an ideal “teleology”, a continuous striving for a universal life-mode of authenticity in a true relative making-finite, towards a critique of factual making-finite as the untrue one, opening up through disagreements revealing themselves. The “unfortunatenesses” are embarrassing, shall not be, [are] against the will to live, which is constantly directed towards unity, truth. Obvious disagreement is necessarily corrected, is deleted, and this means, [it is] not tolerated within the “I am”, [it is] rejected, and that which has been corrected is made accepted, and taken into the Ego being relative into infinity; and motivated therein eventually review and preview and the explicit will of the Ego wishing to be in future only as true Ego that in all its taking position and having a position wants to be true to itself, consciously setting as a goal for itself this faith and the corresponding order of its life.

But the Ego is only within the We, and necessarily the “We” is relativized into infinity, and within the common, within the communalizing emerging in the width of the We-formation it becomes an all-personal We, which shall be a true We. But the truly being world, truly being and forever and for everyone identical, is a mere correlate. Being world in infinity is a constructive anticipation and pre-replacement of the idealized; it is not real, it is only an infinite telos of our freedom.

Then we have the basic differentiation within the apodicticity of the Ego:

I.1) My streaming life and I-identity as the Ego’s polarization of all activity, to which the acts and habitualities, now univocally or temporarily univocally stretching over a time, now cling crushing themselves in a disagreeing way;

2) The proper human Ego, <the> Ego, for which its life has become a life-field with the will to univocality, a true Ego as an idea of the personality being univocal in itself and wanting itself univocally.

II. But now the intermingling of the monads, the necessity of a likewise double constitution of the We, of the “We” in the factual [20] communalization (of the Ego according to 1), and of the awakening all human and all monadic horizons of the universal common life and of the will as common will, to be a universal personal univocality, authenticity as all-person; but its correlate would be a truly (concretely) being world.

<b)> Ego within my primal modality and the post-modal implications

Primal-modal: <Within the> I-am, within the I-can, in the factual I-do <is> implied the further I-can; and especially, I-can: to explicate my being, my implications in their truth; I just perform universal phenomenological sense-investigation, in which I disclose everything, this ability as well.

1) primal-modally standing-streaming life, and therein my original primordial implications, first layer of the world’s constitution, making up my primal modal peculiarity, or rather, my primal “monad”. Therein the primal modal Ego’s pole.

2) Intentional implications of my post-modal changes of my primal modal peculiarities; the implication of foreign peculiarities, of foreign Ego’s poles (of concrete foreign monads), within my own, and of their intentional intermingling, but now of my monad as well as one among the monads, as one it is no longer the primal monad.

3)Implication of the totality of the universe of monads with their Ego’s poles, each as an identical one within all implications, in all inter-subjective acts in their universal inner implication. I function as a pole of acts and habitualities and in community, currently and potentially – the togetherness of the personal Ego.

4) This implies again as an “idea” the true being of us all, and as idea the totality of monads and ideal personal totality as total unity of a truth; authenticity from my freedom in connection with all freedom, on the other side truth of being as well, which is separate from this initially.

5) The true world belongs as correlate to my truth; it is a truly being world (as an idea) for the allness of the monads implied within me, and the monadic Ego. Empirically-factually it is a noematic unity constituted in an intermonadic way, relatively agreeing, relatively disagreeing. Elimination of the single disagreements within the respective communities of understanding as being “repulsive”, and with the anticipation of the possibility to always be able to come to an agreement intersubjectively through correction, to gain a world empirically supposed in a univocal way, and thus in any enlargement of the [21] circle of others entering currently the community of understanding.[[17]](#footnote-18)

World as nature, world as factual mind’s world – each in its relative “truth”, world as true and authentic world, world of authentic men striving to create the world of objects, the world external of men, towards a consequent authenticity (being correlative to authentic humanity). This is an intentional implicate in universal living life as well.

Implied within my primal monad but within the order of implications something late – terminating in that a being world in the strong sense, purely as an idea, once and for all and <forever> being, ideal-identical persisting in its sense of being was equivalent with the idea of an authentic total personality.

This order needs to be considered more closely.

Ad 2) I have an empirically common world implied within the implication of the foreign monad as unity of a univocality (a relative one into infinity) correcting itself. Within the constitution of the others factually at first being presently there as well, the horizon of the further others to be presupposed in open multiplicity as being possible and actual is already in progress; the finiteness is open finiteness, implying further monads, further human world as a common one.

The empirical striving for self-preservation, for satisfaction, and equivalent to that for univocality, is already an intersubjective striving for intersubjective univocality is living within me and then within the implied community, and streaming away towards a conscious will to univocality, from which is determined to derive the will to sense investigation, and <to> universal sense investigation, to the knowledge of being (theoretical interest), eventually towards universal sense investigation, to universal science, this itself further pushing ahead towards intersubjective critique and truth as proceeding universal self-consideration of humanity – radically the transcendental subjectivity itself, continuously self-discovering within an authentic and most concrete sense of truth, and the sense of truth of an authentic world – as to create from the transcendental subjectivity consciously directed thereupon and directed towards its own authentic truth.

The universal actuality is implied in this order – but also the universal of possibilities, implied <is> the structure enabling, going through all conceivable possibilities (considerability is implication)[22], and implied <is> the factuality itself within the factuality of my streaming monadic present.

Does my sleep also, within my now awake streaming being my former un-awakeness of being and my birth, like as future of the awake future imply my death?

My streamingly-living present, the primal modal one, implies everything conceivable; it is the primal temporal, over-temporal “temporalisation”, implying all time as persistingly-being order of time and fullness of time.

Can I have ever begun? Does the having-begun make sense if not as a having within time? I can have a first “awakening”, and a last “awakening” – but a beginning as streamingly “living” present? Without it nothing has a being at all, and thus the others implied in it and the world with human birth and human death.

Men are objectivations of monads; my standing-streaming life as monad is a primal monad, and implicate within it is my monad as one within the all of monads, in which each one is of my kind, as the implied within me as being truth; each is on its own eventually a primal monad, implying me, namely mine, and every other. Each has its first awakeness, beginning of its affective-active “life”, of its personal Ego, and each <has an> end of its personal life; its awakenesses, with sleeping breaks within the awakenesses, with doing and suffering, with all patent consciousness and its latent sedimentations. But is it possible that something one time is not, [something] which is implied within a monad, as carrying all being within?

Concerning this, the following consideration.[[18]](#footnote-19) The being-implied of my past within my streaming present, the being-implied of the other monad within my monad, within my streaming present: implication as a transcendentally simultaneous one. But if we now suppose the other man dies, his body is “de-souled”, stops being a body. The foreign lifetime of other monads corresponds to the life-time of the soul within the world time. Monad within its transcendental life stream: it thus has a beginning and an end after life and being, apart from that a temporal stretching within the transcendental time. Ego, this is intermonadic, and thus my lifetime is with that of the other monads (like within the world-time) in modes of simultaneity, <of> the total and partial one, etc.[[19]](#footnote-20)

One could object now that this concerns life as life of affection and action, and life within the evincing sleeping breaks presenting themselves as post-modal formations [23]; and then it also concerns the personal, the egoical being and being-for-others, simply that which is pregiven in spatio-worldly apperception as a being of human persons and personal communities. Are there any motives, can there be such, which make a further modality of the absolute being appear possible and necessary? Does not the transcendental intersubjectivity, as total subjectivity of the world constitution have its “pauses” as well? Are there any analoga of sleep (of something unconscious)? Not though the communicationlessness of earthly monads and possible Mars-monads now (within the universal simultaneity), with regard to the sequence of time completely destroyed livingness of the tradition, which can still be revitalized by way of archaeological discoveries and interpretation then. These are (meta-mundane-transcendental) questions transcending the whole level of the transcendental world interpretation. The deepest analysis of the different modes of self-communication and communication with others, in the simultaneity and successivity will be of importance there.

C 3

No. 8

The Ego of the epoché. Summer 1933 <Living present as the core of the world phenomenon, and the horizons of representation, the core as the properly perceived>[[20]](#footnote-21)

The first[[21]](#footnote-22) I am in need of is the mark up of the egological field in the pregnant sense. The beginning is: I perform in a completely conscious way the epoché. In doing so I am directed towards myself as the one performing it, and I find as comprised therein the “world phenomenon”, the world as appearing and being believed within the abstinence of the believe in being, instead of the world simply being for me in a natural way.

In this attitude I am not somebody experiencing the world in a natural way, and yet an experiencing one – experiencing all that which has just been named – and still, more concisely, I am somebody experiencing, and firstly, I am somebody continuously perceiving, continuously I perceive myself, my training the abstinence, therein my world phenomenon. All this in one is for me as a streamingly-living present.

Meanwhile we need to distinguish within the contents of the livingly streaming present, in which I find myself in the attitude of the epoché – that is, within my life “perceptually” being for me:[[22]](#footnote-23) We can have present contents among them according to representations, but also non-representations, perceptions.

[25] In which way needs this be understood, since the whole streaming present is perceptual, that we now again have to talk about perceptions and non-perceptions in an obviously special sense? Let us think about it. If a representation now comes up then it is present itself, as that something perceptual, something which in regard with it is perceived as present in the pregnant sense, that of the grasping perception. But within it as representation-of is something represented and within the being-directed towards the streaming away past is the view of the Ego directed towards this past something. This Ego’s view is itself something present, and thereby [it] is not grasped. The past, here we think of a past or coming thing, I-do or I-can (e.g. I have decided myself for the epoché, or I have been conscious that I am able to enter a horizon). It is thus represented within my living content of present, but it does not belong to it itself.

Obviously here the horizons already belong, those which at first are peculiar to each sphere of present in an undisclosed way; in a certain sense they are latent representations, within the streaming present the perceptual horizons themselves are conscious not belonging to this present themselves. Thus we need to differentiate here that of the present (of the perceptually streaming content), which is a consciousness of horizon, and that, which is represented therein as horizon itself, but is not represented intuitively, in explicating remembrances, etc. This is thus properly the first[[23]](#footnote-24): a core of living present, which is not a horizon, and such a [core], which is a horizon. Within this core though again representations can occur, now explicated ones, by the way obviously not only intended ones, but also unintended ones, not only grasping ones but also non-grasping ones; thus again and within that first core we need to differ: something perceptually present, which does not represent within itself any more, and that which does.

But now we have to complete these differentiations essentially, and to continue them in a similar but still essentially new sense with further differentiations.[[24]](#footnote-25)

The experienced world as being experienced now is for the transcendental Ego given perceptually in a streaming present, just that it can [26] at the same time be experienced in this same present in the form of representations[[25]](#footnote-26).

If we try, at least in a first rough try to describe the structure of the transcendental world phenomenon, the way it is given within my transcendental present, we find at first a field of perception within this present as a whole sum of that of the world which is perceptually (“personally there”) given within the Now. The field of perception is transcendentally characterized in itself as a way of givenness of the world and not merely <as a way of givenness> of that which is perceived within the field in one. The field points beyond itself, it is so to say conscious as a perceptual part of the world, it has a “horizon” of the *plus ultra* which is not perceived, which is as such not *explicitely* conscious. Each detail, each special field which possibly becomes conscious for the transcendental Ego afterwards then has such a character, its “horizon” – an external horizon as we wish to say.

<1)>[[26]](#footnote-27) Roughly speaking, to this horizon belongs a multiple evident “I can”: I can enter it in the direction of the past or in the direction of the future, or I can enter in the co-present, lead by the structure of orientation within the present of perception in its manifold directions of orientation entering into the *plus ultra*. Thereby many kinds of descriptions pre-indicate themselves: The entering is a bringing-to-awakening and an actualization of that coming to the awakening through representation, - through remembrance (remembering back), re-representations of something past, through pre-memories (pre-representations of something future), co-remembrances, representations of something co-present of the world.

2) If within the present of perception while desisting from its external horizons, we thus stick to that which is perceptually given of the world, then it is, like the streamingly transcendental present as such, something streamingly-unitary and must become a theme of description as that. The streamingly concrete present of perception, at first with the horizons or rather with the unitary undifferentiated whole horizon, is called streaming due to the differences which I as transcendentally phenomenologizing Ego, as in the living transcendental present as such, can make of it, differences of the Now, of the having-just-been and of the coming. The concrete world phenomenon as my [27] current phenomenon is a phenomenon of the world within the Now.[[27]](#footnote-28) But this is ambiguous. The primal phenomenon of the streaming implies that I differentiate a Now within the at-the-same-time, a having-just-been and a just-coming and that this content of the at-the-same-time is a unit, which – called a concrete phenomenal present – is streaming. An external horizon is constantly there within the streaming[[28]](#footnote-29), changing itself streamingly like the differentiated content of the “at-the-same-time” – all this in special and discoverable structures.

We[[29]](#footnote-30) thus have within the concrete present an abstractable core of a proper present as a distinguished phase within streaming denoting the present which does not include a just-now and a coming any more, but pure present.[[30]](#footnote-31)

It then needs to be described how within the streaming the central pure Now of the present passes continuously within the just-now, (how) this itself goes through modes of the just-now, etc., and how eventually and within the streaming constantly the “dark” external horizon takes the just-now into its undifferentiated darkness; how though the recollections then enter this darkness and can produce within the present next to their living progress of perception the mental living of the past, the past presents of perception as such; similar structural problems and structural descriptions with regard to the coming.

If we limit the core of the “proper” perceptual present of the world (always as a transcendental phenomenon) in an abstractive way, then the question now concerns the structure of this core,[[31]](#footnote-32) - a structure which returns in the change of the main mode of the proper present of perception into present which has “just now” been, etc., only with new signs so to say, with a changed sense of form, then many kinds of new structural differentiations result.

If, on close regard, with the hinted at differentiations of the inner temporalization within the concrete phenomenon of present new kinds of horizons describe themselves as “inner”[[32]](#footnote-33) ones (the “references”, intentionalities belonging to the streaming and change of givenness within the streaming), then we soon arrive from there at new differentiations with new inner horizons. [28] We proceed in a certain direction here in order to differentiate once more a core of properness within the proper present core of the phenomenon world (or within the proper field of perception of the world, delineating the co-moment now-appearing-to-me-from-it). This or that appearing world objects belong to this field in which structure of co-existence ever. Each one and thus the proper field of present is given as a whole in a “proper” way only perceptually from one “side”.[[33]](#footnote-34) This “side” is a side of the perceived and in the first sense of the “properly” perceived as such. Only the “traits”, inner distinctions of the object it encompasses, are perceived “properly” in a new, stricter sense, actually characterized as something “personally self” present “of the” object. This “of” obviously delineates a new “inner horizon”; the side can be examined concerning the other sides, it points to possibilities of discovering within possibilities (within my abilities as well) of the future perception and abilities of representation, with corresponding essential forms.

If I follow the course of streaming within the concrete present then the unity phenomenon of the changing of side into side goes through the series of sides, but also the unity phenomenon of the same thing showing itself from different sides goes through – as long as it simply appears personally within the field.

But[[34]](#footnote-35) this is not all. Within the holding view on any trait, e.g. a bodily one of form or color remaining constantly as being properly perceived within the constant changing of its sides, then it does appear as the same, but as the same within constantly different ways of givenness, in different perspectives. Thus, the properly appearing trait again has itself something proper in an even more proper sense, in a radical sense something given in a properly original way: the perspective as perspective of this trait.[[35]](#footnote-36) And now this perspective with the “of” has its horizon; only the perspective is no longer itself a content part of the worldly, of the object which “appears”, but [is] something by the help of which the self-appearing of the object’s trait is actualized. This “by-the-help-of” points towards a proper direction of the recourse of the analysis of the [29] perceptual phenomenon of the world and some worldly single thing. We rest at that as far as the direct being-a-phenomenon of something worldly is concerned.

Of course, in the changing of the side’s givennesses and of the description of the synthetic unity showing itself thereby, the proper behavior of the whole field needs to be heeded especially – the way an enlarged field, an enlarged present of the world constitutes itself synthetically within its change in the streaming proper present of the world, whereby within the transgression objects leave the proper present and new ones enter.

No.9

My transcendental being as a concrete primal living present. <In the phenomenological reduction I find myself in the streaming life as a concrete Ego in different modes of my temporality>[[36]](#footnote-37)

Constitution[[37]](#footnote-38) of the “immanent data” within the streaming “immanent perception” – and the problems of the streamingly living present.

The immanent object is “included” in the immanent perceiving as a being actuality, it “constitutes” itself within the streaming perceiving. The constituting is in a certain sense a building-oneself. Phase for phase of the object enters the primal present, now gives way to a new phase, which actualizes itself now, etc. But one needs to be cautious.

Phenomenological reduction has freed me of natural naivety. Now I am no more with the natural sense being for me a human Ego in the world. Thus I am not accepted by me; and yet I am still for me. I experience myself as a “pure Ego” directed towards myself and striving to analyze myself as being this transcendental Ego, [directed] towards me as being. [30]

I grasp myself in the first explanations as being temporarily within a streaming temporalization, i.e. within a continuous self-experiencing streaming along, perceiving, originally appearing to me itself, that is, in the form of my now streaming being present, or rather, of the livingly streaming perceptual way of being. In this present I perform remembrances, and through them my past shows itself to me in my living present as my present one itself, that is, <as> having-been in a streamingly-perceptual way, and likewise I have presently before me my coming being-present myself, my horizon of futureness.

I find myself within my own temporality and I find myself as an identical Ego of my being temporarily presenting itself as now present, as past and as future. These streamingly changing modes still are identical contents of my temporal being, i.e., that one which constitutes my temporality itself as showing itself in the change of these modes. In this regard I see that indeed present goes over into past and ever new past within the change, but that through all its changes of past that which shows itself as “now” remains identical in its individuality, the identical form of which is the point in time. And thus the immanent time, belonging to me as an identical Ego, persists within the stream of time modalities and as the form constituting itself as identical within its change, that is, with the content identifying itself at points, the content constituting my persisting subjective being within my temporalization.

Certainly thereby my identical past constituted within the streaming modes of past and my future being continuously anticipated in the streaming actualization of the coming differ, but future anticipated as identical in the change of the future modes as, thus, what I am, as I-have-been, and what I am, insofar as I am will-be.

The streaming streamingly constitutes an identical have-been and an identical will-be – will-have-been; and the difference itself now is streaming. That which now is settled as past, remains rigid; that which is not yet settled, as only becoming, i.e. anticipation of the rigid being as a will-be in coming performance of settling.[[38]](#footnote-39) Thereby this coming is a realm of many possibilities, and essentially it is not and in no present firmly determined. The coming in a different way as “foreseen” [31] is always an open option, and that which has been foreseen has essentially undetermined contents determining themselves completely just within actualization.

Only the Ego is an unbreakable certainty; <Ego,> standing within the evidence of the “I am”, having a “settled”, a determinedly being been-ness – we usually say past; been-ness is been-ness in streaming pasts changing in contrast – and before me a future comprehended streamingly within the actualization, as in all predelineation an area of undetermined options of a future still thus far determined that it has within the certainty of the coming will-be the firm form of the already actual being, that of a coming rigid past.

By[[39]](#footnote-40) my making such analyses, I speak of the streaming, of the livingly streaming perceptual present, of the streamingly changing subjective modes of the pasts and futures showing themselves within the streamingly living present; of the retentions and distance-remembrances change themselves within this present in manifold ways and change as modes of remembrance, in which one and the same having-been is conscious as something subjectively past in different ways (like something farther and farther past within the talking).

If I thus constantly speak of my[[40]](#footnote-41) temporal being and of the subjective modes of appearance, conscious modes, while this fulfilled temporality which is mine is made conscious to me, then I face the issue that still these modes of consciousness as well, that this streamingly being, in which my temporal being “appears”, shows itself and becomes originally evident, is mine; spoken from my position: that I am only as living within this streaming life and that by way of the special structures of this life I have a temporal being for me within the generally described peculiarities.

But how about the being of this streaming, the “streamingly living present”, the remembrances showing themselves within it, etc.? By my reflecting them, by my getting to know them, by my dedicating there being and being thus to me, by my identifying them repeatedly – are they not themselves being as being temporally, identical within a temporal locus, which is experienced as the same in different modes of remembrance, or rather, modes of changing subjective being past? Viewing this streamingly living present I find it as a present streaming. The giving of a tone for example appears at first within it in the mode [32] of the primal present; in the change of retention it appears as the same having just past, in the change of pasts as the same having been and in this sameness as temporally the same (the same temporal locus).

But if I direct my view to the streaming away of retentions, to the repeated recollections (the manifold pasts of the same tone date), to the whole streaming present with all these subjective appearances-of, then everything under such headings is graspable, as being for me. The same I now perceive as being present, that which I have conscious afterwards as just past and in ever new modes of past, and possibly experience in an intuitive way again and again; and to this sameness, the same been-ness, its temporal locus respectively belongs simply as form of the been-ness, as individual form, as form of the singularity of being, of the being as that uniquely identical – in contrast to the manifoldness of streaming ways of givenness.

This is clear: If I reflect upon me under phenomenological reduction, and if I experience myself as the one I am, then I experience myself within a first layer. I experience myself as within a first and necessarily only within a first and in a merely relative way of being, as an Ego of the immanent time within a first sense. Thereby the modes of streaming and of the streaming constitution being within view serve as a mere passage; they function as subjective ways of experience and as the „mere subjective“ thereby functioning they are pushed aside so to say; they do not become thematic themselves as constitutive in a new way for the „I am“. Almost similar to the natural scientist, who has nature as his objective field of being and as experiential field by pushing aside all subjective, the changing ways of appearance of nature as „something merely subjective“ and, where he encounters it, excludes it consciously from his theme.

But I gain the concrete subjectivity, making my being within phenomenological reduction, through an renewed thematic reflection. I experience myself as the subjectivity being within streaming life and constituting myself within the first temporality. My immanent-temporal being in the given first sense is then something constituted within the being of the reflectively higher layer of being, in that one, in which I as something living within streaming present and within it through the manifold ways of appearance essentially belonging to it constitute myself in the immanently temporal being as a synthetic unity. In other words I go back to my more radical subjective being, which is not superimposed in a proper word sense (which is taken from the spatio-temporal sphere of being) via the immanent-temporal being in the first [33] sense, but carries it as „something constituted“ within itself. This inexistence must be understood, seen in its peculiarity. The constituted is not real within the constituting; the perceiving does not have the perceived within it as a thing has its parts. The immediate self-giving of the primal perception is a mode of experience having beside himself the other modes essentially belonging to it, those of retention, of recollection, etc., and only as a unity of these manifold modes, experienced as identity unit within their synthesis, is the being indeed experienced as something being – here we need to raise the consciousness of the horizon of possible experience as that of the field, <that is> to ever again enter in order to ever again continue the identification. But this needed a special explication.

I am within my streaming life, I am, as further becomes apparent, not this streaming life itself; but I am only who I am within this streaming life’s form of being and in the capabilities, tendencies, actualizations, etc., related to this. Now, the streaming life is, as we said, itself only being as a unity of manifold consciousnesses; or, to put it another way, it temporalizes the first immanent sphere but it is itself within a temporalization, and thus ever again – we stand within an iteration, and one will worry to get into a supposedly counter sense endless regress.

Initially I need to accept that, which I see in original experiencing evidence, and thus it is a basic knowledge, and a first one of phenomenology, that my being, and apodictically, is experienced within the I-am of phenomenological reduction, but in such a way that I, analyzing the concretion of this being, need to go through the course of an iterative reflection and find my being as something identical of an iteratively and within the iteration still unitarily combining self-temporalization, in which something temporalizing itself is only as something temporalized. [[41]](#footnote-42)

(How about the spatio-temporal experience as the temporalization through which worldly real being constitutes itself in its form of temporality – the spatio-temporality.

Here now we need to distinguish two things: the intersubjective objectivity of the world as world for all men, or rather, as a world, which is constituted within the transcendental intersubjectivity, but still for me, the experiencing one, perceiving world and constituting it from his original experience and from the constitution (he performs within himself) of the others as experiencing the same world within themselves. [34]

My experience with things and initially my direct perception of the same,[[42]](#footnote-43) in abstraction of co-being others (as being for me due to foreign experiences) as Ego-subjects for the same things, as my perceiving mentally living belongs to the realm of my pure subjectivity and closer to my streaming life, like the empathies emerging therein and the ways of consciousness derived thereof; but this purely taken as my mental living under epoché of the others’ transcendent being, set as being, and mediately of the intersubjective meanings stemming from them. But if we stick to our „primordial“ perceptions and experiences and to their syntheses proceeding in the form of univocality, in which the same things respectively and eventually the same nature constitutes itself, then the proceeding experiences are immanent temporalities within the unity of my transcendental subjectivity (of my concrete Ego) constituting itself for itself in iterative-immanent temporalization. In these syntheses now something natural constitutes itself as something being transcendent to the immanence. The perception is as an „external“ one a mental living transcending the immanence, but this only as a moment of the universal synthetic experience of nature, which not only is an actual process within my transcendental subjectivity, but is in its way as process immanently constituted for me, although not as a current mental living. Under the title of immanence not only the actually now conscious as livingly streaming mental livings of my transcendental Ego do stand, but also the horizons of mental living with the corresponding consciousness of capability, the <being-able-to->analyze-them and the process of my past mental living meant in an „obscure“ way within them and to be able to discover that of my coming [mental living]. I am for me an Ego of a temporal life springing from living present, but also shows the whole immanent temporality as a cohering expression within it. Each perception of a thing as a momentary mental living does not only stand within the whole life’s horizon of my immanent temporality, but is a moment of a therein especially constituted horizon of actual and above that of possible experiences, the discovery of which brings to light my special „external“ experiencing, my actual and possible, in the univocal connection of which the same nature, the same respectively single things of nature are experienced, or rather, have been experienced, have been perceived, possibly could have been perceived, have been pre-experienced as coming ones, etc.)

[35]

No.10

<Basic structures of the concrete subjectivity>[[43]](#footnote-44)

Basic structure[[44]](#footnote-45) of the singular-concrete subjectivity – psychologically of the soul in its pure being peculiar, transcendentally of the transcendental subjectivity, as the primordial, namely of the transcendental Ego, and of the transcendental „single subjectivity“ (monad) in the higher concretum of the transcendental intersubjectivity.

1. We differ:

The Ego and its life: We say I am who I am, within my life. And this life is mentally living,[[45]](#footnote-46) its reflectively to be distinguished pieces of content are rightfully called mental livings, insofar as something is mentally lived within them. They have the essential character to have something conscious within themselves. But the Ego is „subject“ of the consciousness.[[46]](#footnote-47) Subject is thereby just another word for the centralization, which every life as Ego-life has, and thereby to mentally live something in a living way, to have something conscious.

2) How is the Ego centre of this „mentally living“ life, how does it mentally live? It is affected by that, which the consciousness is conscious of, it follows the affection or is for example drawn by some affecting, kept and taken ... And not only that, the Ego mentally lives and lives as an awake Ego actively, it lives into a horizon of mentally living, into a horizon of the mentally lived, <of the> being-for-it, and this living into, this being-in awake-activity is of a special kind.

The horizon of being is a horizon of interests, and the single acts are not without any connection, they are not only as such centered within the Ego, but they are connected in chains towards the unity of a striving life, and especially such unities of chains then are interconnected in [36] covered ways.[[47]](#footnote-48) The Ego <is> „consciously“ <directed> towards the unity of a goal in many acts being ordered to it, striving, actually leading towards the goal, bringing near to it; the Ego is consciously directed through them towards the goal and to the media as mediation of the goal.

But also in the way of obscure striving does the Ego have a direction-to, where the goal hovers before it in an unclear way; and still <in such a way that> what happens from the Ego, happens in such a way, that it experiences a relative fulfillment of its striving, mentally lives within it a coming closer, a coming further in the obscure aiming, or else <a> not satisfying missing, being inhibited.

3) But here are still some differentiated structures – a) life of the consciousness as mentally living in the above sense, consciousness-of; b) the Ego-striving in its positive and negative modes, or its active and affective, <is> directed „through“ the consciousness towards the conscious (within the modes of <being> directed, etc.) and the act and affect, etc., of the Ego <is> in a certain way a beam of direction coming from (or going into) the identical Ego-pole (to properly bring out this structure of identity) as something experienceable in itself.

4) But when we use these words, then we see: The same Ego can instead of being straightly directed towards something conscious, simply be directed towards the being directed, also towards the style of direction, towards itself as a pole; thus on higher levels we have again a field of consciousness, that of reflection (a „mentally lived“ field of being), again Ego and the being directed. Thus in an iterative way.

5) Basic structure[[48]](#footnote-49): a lowest mentally living belongs to the essence of the Ego, which is the presupposition for all reflecting, with a lowest field of consciousness, and as a field of the consciousness-of without any reflection in the lowest sense, and directedness towards that which is conscious there, <thereby> to have the related horizon as a horizon of life, whereby within this naive being-straightly-directed-towards-the primary-objects-and-horizons-of-objects as a living along, the strivingly functioning life itself and the striving Ego itself is anonymous.

6) Further theme: modes of striving and capabilities, modes of the doing of the striving „passively“ having an impact, of the doing in the lowest sense, then of the doing in the higher sense, the willingly, etc. The Ego as the center of the capabilities.

[37] 7) Furthermore: The Ego of ability, the striving, the capable, the non-inhibited and inhibited, overcoming the inhibition, etc. performs, living into its field of consciousness, „accomplishments“, gains results, builds ever new forms of the being-for-it and of the consciousness of the being.

8) The consciousness of and its modes, the structure of subjectivity, to be directed towards fields of being, and essentially to have a lowest field of being – to form progressive-genetic fields of being and to constitute at the lowest (or at the highest) a world being for it as a pre-given realm of its „self-preservation“, the higher fields in their unity and back-relatedness to the basic field world.

No.11

<Unity of the Ego in disagreeing tendencies>

We say of the Ego that it is directed towards something, and that it is directed towards its being a „subject“ of acts. Closely related this means that it can direct itself, that it is a subject of capabilities. A capability corresponds to each act.

How about the being-directed-towards-something, but also being-affected-thereof? Tendency towards „the Ego“, within the act, tendency from the Ego towards the something, the tendency living itself out towards something, fulfilling.[[49]](#footnote-50) Explication – synthesis of tendencies-towards, in „partial“ covering. The something is determined as the same. But the secondary realizing and determining-oneself (possibly); unitary tendency of a higher step going through the one and lower tendency to A and B, primarily to A and in the mode „alongside“ to B, having its effect primarily and properly within the explication <of> A and taking along a little bit of B. Modes of the synthesis of tendencies, a tendency going through tendencies. Many tendencies within the unity of a tendency. Main tendencies and lesser tendencies, many tendencies in each of which one single direction keeps itself, in a manifoldness of explications. Disagreeing tendencies as well. All-inclusive unity of tendencies in „an Ego“ – all tendencies have a certain synthetic unity of tendency. An Ego, a unity of the whole ray, of the whole intention-to (i.e. consciousness-of), unity of the consciousness not a unitary [38] *tabula rasa*, a unitary stream of things, but a uni-versal unity of intentions, of directions and counter-directions.

Now the question is, how the unity of the Ego needs to be understood from the synthesis of all intentional directions. Does here the essential peculiarity come into question, that the tendencies are indeed manifold-unitary, but that this unity has still its specialty? At first, an act is in any particular case and always the dominating one and it dominates through special acts (the special tendencies becoming active), through them goes the fulfillment. The affection goes in front and it turns into the devotion and now in action. The „point of turn“ is the beginning of the act and of the many-rayed splitting into sub-ordered acts.

But how far does this kind of unification reach, which, although it is always there, still needs a closer clarification? Am I not at the same time an Ego of manifold interests, of which now only one lives out as the dominant one?

1) Active directions, the intention as direction towards a goal, the goal is relative where it actualizes through explication; and the synthesis of its relative ends, in which the whole intention fulfills itself. But a goal stretching in this way in relativity and through relative ends, and possibly demanding ever new [ends] explicitly, can unify with other goals. Direction towards a plurality or direction through a plurality, of which each detail denotes a direction and a manifoldness of the impact. From the sides of the goal – a goal can extend by way of taking further goals into a unit of targeting. How do all targets organize themselves into the unity, or is there no need?

No.12

„Mentally living“[[50]](#footnote-51)

<The structure of the mentally living in significances>

1) The Ego in its egoically striving life (the Ego within the „personal“ self-preservation) is related to its environment as its field of activity, it is the constant intentional horizon of the natural human-personal being.

[39] 2) The natural environment „appears“ in experiential appearances of the experiencing life; „through“ appearances the Ego mentally lives worldlinesses, its mentally living is consciousness of something worldly, then being-directed-through-appearances – but also in a correlative double sense, that which the Ego as a substrate of personal peculiarities picks up personally within the living along and the living-within-the-world, for example a new knowledge or cognition it picks up, a lasting acquirement as its personal property, etc. But there the significance comes up, that which is important to me, that on which I place value, and now have as my own personal value. Thus I get into another theme there; the common concept of the mentally living mainly relates to significances. Mentally lived is that which has somehow made an „impression“ on me, and which I therefore picked up, furthermore, that which I strived for, and which was important to me, and then it was important to me that I missed it or that I gained it through resistance, etc.

We will leave aside the problem of this importance or significance and the special unity, which my striving life has within the habitual synthesis of my significances, and my personal structure corresponding to it. In a way ignoring this, one can initially call mentally lived everything being current for me, my surrounding world, the things being for me as becoming conscious to me, and my life of consciousness as making manifold the appearing (the appearances), as mentally living life. The question is then afterwards, what kind of forming a structure is something significant and insignificant, grasped, verified, dropped, and put-out-of-significance. A different reasoning differentiates itself, a “verifying”, the recollecting oneself and having in memory, that is, having in the acceptance of being (or modified in cancelled acceptance, having-modalized as such). If I am interested especially in being, then proved acceptance has significance for me, the true-being is my interest, is „important“ to me. End targets – goals, their actualization results in something important for me, as that it is strived for in advance. Goals of striving are importances. To let drop a goal, to prefer another one is to put it out of importance, to push it aside as insignificant, the preferred one is more important to me, and possibly now is important alone. The choosing preferring and letting drop, the passive life of striving, its striving grasping and passively preferring, passively pass over something else, letting it drop.

But importance in a deeper sense. Overview over my life in unity for me as connection of my importances lasting; a life by which I stand continuously and by which I am able to stand. Movement of these importances, the ethical life.

[40]

No.13

Reduction

<a) Reduction of the world to the world phenomenon and reduction of the mundane Ego to the pure Ego and the streaming life as the absolute ground of all my acceptances>

1) We take up the phenomenological attitude, we reduce towards the transcendental Ego, to the streaming being living, the Ego, as that which I am, which is the subject of all acceptances, through which each and everything that is for me, myself as well, is simply for me, is accepted by me.

Within the bracketing of the world being for me and of all being accepted by me in advance I am led back to the Ego, for which the world is a phenomenon of acceptance. With regard to the world the epoché closes it as a judging ground being valid in advance and opens the way of judging the world, purely the way it is a respective phenomenon for me, as the Ego, that has this phenomenon, and has [it] continuously, as a phenomenon of acceptance. The transcendental Ego is as that not pregiven, not in advance accepted as that, but it becomes accepted in the radical epoché within the cognition that the reduction to the phenomenon indeed inhibits my being a man in the world (in its judging positability), but still leaves me in positability as a „pure“ Ego apprehended by its own pure essence. In other words: The bracketing of my<self> as man makes me discover the streamingly being life, in which world, in which I, man, worldly being, am conscious and lastingly conscious of me as a man among other ones being within the world, in streaming ways of appearance, in changing modes of acceptance.

Unavoidably[[51]](#footnote-52) the talking is of „me“ and my life, in which ..., and the talking is of: The same Ego and life, if I put world as such, also belonged to the man I am myself. I can also say, that which is proper to me, the man, as his human, purely inner living present, and then has its place within the spatiotemporality of the world, remains simply the same, as untouched by the epoché, as an absolute positability taken from all worldliness, as streamingly being present, as the absolute ground of all my acceptances, also of those through which I accept myself as a man.

[41] This ground alone I keep when I avoid every question as to what the world is (which is already presupposed as being and in acted acceptance) and ask at last, how in this primal streaming being, in this primal streaming present something worldly and world itself comes into lasting acceptance, how, with what content or sense emerging within it, in which modalities of acceptance, in which modes of passing or persisting, empirical or apodictical acceptances. I do not judge the world, but my primal living being, and the “world as such“ being meant therein, being accepted.

I do not take the pregiven world in its pregivenness and being-thus, but I make the being pregiven of world and of this world as being and being thus a theme, exactly in its streaming modes, of which the being-pregiven-to-me, the being thus and thus accepted by me, the thus and thus corroborating itself consists. In other words, world is for me a continuously-living prejudice and in a certain way the universe of all my prejudices within the natural life. I perform radical prejudicelessness in asking back as to the primal place of all my judgments, of all matters of course whose universal title is the world having been acquired by myself or being taken over traditionally and eventually being hidden at first through inexplicity and still determining me. This primal place is my livingly streaming present, the streaming life in which all being-accepted-by-me and therein being-for-me emerges, as a thing, as a process, as another man, as Ego, man himself among the others, also universally as a world in which <I> live, whereby all that shall now be purely taken thus then as my subjective phenomenon, the way it emerges, and as nothing else but as a moment of this life itself.[[52]](#footnote-53)

<b) The transcendental Ego as pole of affection and action. Awakeness and the vitalization of sleeping habitualities within the concrete Ego>

2) If we consider this transcendental Ego, or if I consider myself as to how I need to be set before all my prejudices, all the being for me, as primal condition for their being-sense for me, then I find myself as a streaming present. The I-am, I am conscious of this and that in the widest sense, which, lacking another one, the concept “I think” (this and that) wanted to delimit as well (to which belongs the I-feel, I-want, etc.) is an I-am within the living streaming, and this is streamingly-having-present [42] and streaming present itself – a doublesidedness initially difficult to be grasped – like the analytical descriptions have their difficulties within this primal sphere.

The life of consciousness – original consciousness of within the living present (thereby also consciousness of in original representation, recollection, preconsideration), also <in the mode of the> quasi. In contrast to that the non-original consciousness of.

Immanence – each consciousness of is itself originally conscious; steps of temporalization, change, streamingly changing-itself from the first originality into the just now, etc. Then originally present representation, itself again streaming away, originally present empty consciousness, etc.

This life <is> at first an egological life and as mine, of the bethinking himself, life, - a constituting life. “To constitute” is to ever again produce continuous and discrete syntheses; thereby it is an egocentric life of passivity, affectivity and activity.

Life is encompassed by a universal essential regularity of passivity: the synthesis of association. From there ever again new synthetic associative unities spring, the “data” of the immanent time as form of the unities of immanence and of the unity of the stream of mentally living constituting itself. But the unities of mentally living delineating themselves within this sphere, called worldly perceptions, constituting worldly experiences, worldly mere opinions, the unities of worldliness and the world universe as its universal unit, these unities rest in their constitution mainly on activities of the Ego, whereby the foreign Egos and their immanent mental livings being constituted as being as well within the immanent life of the Ego enter along into the constitution.

Unities constitute themselves continuously in many steps from unification, and unification can mean a successive process, but also a simultaneous unification, in which is already unification and unit, certainly constituting a lasting unit only within the successive process. Thus the stream of consciousness is in each phase already a unit of coexistence and still a unit of the concrete stream only through the phases’ synthesis of the stream.

Within[[53]](#footnote-54) the awake life the Ego is awake as an Ego, as an identical pole of affections and actions occurring within the awake life as changing immanent data, as mental livings. Within them and within the Ego lies the properly awake as living within them, being awake in the affections in specialty, being in an awake way active in the actions, within the awake being-there and Ego’s life. But this [43] properly awake is nothing for itself, it is what it is on the basic ground of the unawakeness. Within the concrete Ego there lies a basic layer of the “sleep”.[[54]](#footnote-55) But like the awake Ego as a pole (and as a pole determined through its respective life: I within my life), is identically the same Ego, only now thus, now thus living in an awake way, thus it is, insofar as it is a sleeping Ego, the same Ego. Everything that can be woken again for me or “within” me, but is not woken, is within sleep; among that all my being-accepted-by-me still lasting in “habituality”, being-real-for-me, being-known-to-me, being-peculiar-to-me as a theory, peculiar to me as something beautiful being dedicated to me, as my work, my doing, as my decision.

I do not think of all of this kind now, or rather, it is not an actual activity now, not proceeding in an awake way. It is also not only an activity that has been; the whole realm of that which is now accepted by me, me, the awake Ego, the whole of my convictions, but of those which are not used now, belongs to the sphere of the “sleeping” basic ground.[[55]](#footnote-56)

This needs to be understood in he following way: Each act is a making-accepted or putting out of acceptance or in another way a modality of making-accepted; let us comprise it under the title “making-accepted”. That which is accepted by me is my conviction as being-made-accepted (in its respective mode), not only in this moment, in which I have formed the conviction “anew” (primal formation), that is, with the “new” giving acceptance to, the first one. If this act is gone, then I can for that which it started, possibly wake up, come back to it.

If we take as a first and basic case for clarification that I recollect the past act and its final performance (it may possibly have grown from a complicated activity), the conviction as a formation from the doing convincing me. That I recollect my Ego and my doing as being past, does not say though, that within the current act of being-affected and turning-to-in-recollection and within[[56]](#footnote-57) the possibly explicit process of the recollecting representation I am directed towards the past Ego and the act. Usually I am directed towards my former conviction, e.g. the truth I have gained, the decision I have taken (volitional conviction), although this is “conscious” within the recollection as formation of the act.

[44] But if I reflect “within” the recollection, i.e., if I direct myself (as I am able to) towards the I-think of the respective thought, towards the deciding, in which it has come to the decision (of the will’s response, or rather, conviction) then I find myself as the same Ego, the same which has been active and which is now still active (although differently), is awake. And I find: I have been and still am: I have lived and still live.[[57]](#footnote-58)

The living present, an awake stretch “within streaming” and the past present (in its past awakeness “again” represented) are separated by an “obscure” time period, a “distance”, which, dependent on how I test different distances within the repeated recollections, is now “bigger”, now smaller.

My current present has a horizon of an obscure, sunken past. I can light it up through recollection, and the recollection gives its past as belonging to this horizon. It represents itself its past present with <a> horizon as well. To this belongs a stretch of future, to which my present and something between it and that past belongs, an in-between which is already past, and is still (unfulfilled) future for the past present, but now in the form of this “in-between” is for me a fulfilled, done future of that past. I can disclose this “in-between”, and can thus, between each recollected past and the Now, the in-between through continuously proceeding recollection of that “which has come afterwards and afterwards”.

Thus I get to know the past horizon of my present within the activity of the memory jumping back and then again continuously proceeding, and the continuity of my past, mine, as far as I find the identical Ego as an identical Ego pole of all represented presents, all past, therein, in each <as> points of emission of the acts, in each in the way of the “livingness” of present streaming into the obscurity, but in each resting as that of the identically persisting Ego, which as an identical one performs ever new acts, etc.

Thus I interpret the passive grounds as well and their way, to still be without affecting, etc. As to the acts now and their performances of acceptance, their being is within the mode of the present streamingly-streaming-away-being, thereby constantly changing not within the mode of awakeness at first, but within the [45] mode of primal temporalization and its imaginability.[[58]](#footnote-59)
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35. *Rb.:* Perspective also to be understood in a broader sense – the bodiliness has not been astracted from it previously. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. *Sheets 10-16 of C3 are printed as text no.7 in Husserliana XV, page 99-110. The label on the cover sheet 18/24 relates to text no.9:* streamingly-living present. The immanent time-field. Constitution of immanent data. Constitution of the streaming duration. 1930. November. For elaboration II. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. *Rb.:* 1-4 for elaboration. From November 1930. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. *Rb.:* Having been identically the same, manifold pasts. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. *Rb.:* My being as living primal present. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. *Instead of* my *Ms.* our [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. *For the following passage a zero in the margin.* [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. *After* the same *in the MS follows* gives to me. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. *The heading on the cover sheet 25-52 relates to the texts 10-13:* March 1931. For elaboration. Reduction to the living present as the last absolute ground of all my acceptances. Structures of the living present: 1) passive association, 2) The structure of an act, in detail 1b to 5 akaweness and unawakeness („sleep“), habituality, recollection of an act, and still having the conviction. Modes of an acts; 3-6. Habituality and activity. Awakeness, waking up, sleep. 3) 6ff. The Ego and the constituted world. The transcendental „constituting the world“, „the steadiness“ of the constitution. Perceptional field. Layers and Stepps of the temporalizatin as structures within the living present. All explication itself within the lieving present, 10-12, steps of the temporalization. 12ff. Ego. Ego-centralizing, questions of the Ego. 14b, patency – latency: sedimentation, wakening. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. *Rb.:* Good. Beginning of the Ego’s problems. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. *Rb.:* Life as mentally living. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. *Rb.:* „Subject“. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. *Rb.:* Act of the Ego and horizon of the act – horizon in a correlative sense. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. *Rb.:* Layer of the lowest life of the Ego – in contrast to the reflections. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. *Rb.:* Instead of tendency better striving, ray of acting towards. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. *Rb.:* Single sheet. Mentally living. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. *From* unavoidably *to* remains*, in square brackets, Rb.: More cautiously!* [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
52. Compare farther below to the primal phenomenal streaming 72 *(sheet 39b, here page 50f. may be meant).* [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
53. *Rb.:* Awakeness. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
54. *Rb.:* Unawakeness. Habituality. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
55. *Rb.:* Habituality. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
56. *Instead of* within *Ms. only* the [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
57. *Rb.:* I still have the conviction. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
58. *Rb.:* Structure of the act and modes of the act. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)