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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>[[1]](#footnote-1)

The first[[2]](#footnote-2) 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:[[3]](#footnote-3) 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[[4]](#footnote-4): 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.[[5]](#footnote-5)

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[[6]](#footnote-6).

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)>[[7]](#footnote-7) 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.[[8]](#footnote-8) 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[[9]](#footnote-9), changing itself streamingly like the differentiated content of the “at-the-same-time” – all this in special and discoverable structures.

We[[10]](#footnote-10) 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.[[11]](#footnote-11)

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,[[12]](#footnote-12) - 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”[[13]](#footnote-13) 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”.[[14]](#footnote-14) 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[[15]](#footnote-15) 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.[[16]](#footnote-16) 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>[[17]](#footnote-17)

Constitution[[18]](#footnote-18) 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.[[19]](#footnote-19) 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[[20]](#footnote-20) 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[[21]](#footnote-21) 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. [[22]](#footnote-22)

(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,[[23]](#footnote-23) 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]
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<Basic structures of the concrete subjectivity>[[24]](#footnote-24)

Basic structure[[25]](#footnote-25) 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,[[26]](#footnote-26) 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.[[27]](#footnote-27) 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.[[28]](#footnote-28) 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[[29]](#footnote-29): 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.
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<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.[[30]](#footnote-30) 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?
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„Mentally living“[[31]](#footnote-31)

<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]
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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[[32]](#footnote-32) 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.[[33]](#footnote-33)

<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[[34]](#footnote-34) 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”.[[35]](#footnote-35) 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.[[36]](#footnote-36)

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[[37]](#footnote-37) 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.[[38]](#footnote-38)

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.[[39]](#footnote-39)

If an act is a total act, synthetically (polythetically) built out of multiple acts, then the following needs to be heeded: the awake Ego-pole radiates many uniformly combined rays so to say, a bundle of rays – it is <an> Ego focused on the unity of multifarious performance. Each ray (subordinate special act) still remains a present act, still remains in function as well until the completion of the whole act, despite the temporalizing modification and that of its finished part action (the having-completed <that>, which had been its part). (The “still” in function means its peculiar modification, which is not a mere passage into retention, into the having-just-been.)

When the act is completed, i.e. when its performance is completed, then it sinks into darkness; according to the passive order of temporalization not only the “intuitiveness” vanishes, but also the inner distinctions flow away.

Now this sinking into the retentional mode, instead of being a mere act-passivity, as if I attempt something else and “abandon” the act formation, can also remain animated through activity, in that way that for example I remain directed toward the result (like the formed thought) or actively direct myself to it afterwards and then within a ray. It [the activity] may already have streamed away, and I may already have turned to something else, and still I may come back, may direct my view back; be it because it [the result] remains in active and proper retention in the form of the still-controlled (not-being-abandoned-completely), and goes back; be it that a new affection emanates from that, which has streamed away, and that I return to the recent: which, as in each affection of a formation, is an affection for a reactivation.

Thus with regard to the activity are distinguished: 1) the current activity, in which the Ego is directed towards act results with modes of the grasping, and seizing, functioning, 2) the activity having passed by, in which the result has been abandoned, but still is accepted, 3) in which the result, or rather, the performance, is out of validity (modalized).

I retrieve it, it is still the same; I find myself and my original generating within the recollection, and [I find] myself, the same Ego which I still am, accepting the same, accepting as the current Ego, which “goes along” (“acknowledges”, but in the way of the taking over “without more ado”).

Likewise in the case of distant recollection. I was – was the Ego performing an acceptance. But this acceptance is not a mental process passing by [46] and the stream of mental processes is not subordinate to the order of an option to recollect a mental process, in which the series of mental processes having passed by, among them the act’s mental processes, would again simply become apparent in the mode of the being past. What does this mean: a reproduced acceptance is still accepted?

Within the living present I understand the continuing acceptance, namely as the continuity of the act itself from its onset <until> its coming-to-an-end within its constituting performance, and then from the still-remaining-in-one’s-grip of this performance, with the again-being-able-to-go-back-to-the-unity and to be able to restitute and identify them in the mode “again”.[[40]](#footnote-40) While going back I can also see the difference between the mode of the keeping within a polythetically-uniform act of a higher order (of the keeping within a function for a higher performance, to which the [performance] having just been accomplished and acquired contributes) and the <mode of the> still-having-the-acquisition, although it, the performance having become a possession, has been set free from the grip, since the Ego has entered a new activity now, is now included in a new proposal.[[41]](#footnote-41)

But these are not all the differences. I may abandon for now that, which I have acquired, since something quite different attracts me, - not abandon like a still unused, but “possibly” to be used fact, namely to be used as a premise, within a unitary cognitive performance (while the put-aside and the being-abandoned still functions), but in such a way that I remain actively directed towards that which has been abandoned, and keep it in function in view of further performances, but [I] have interrupted my activity directed on that – like being carried along by the affection of an object standing outside, in order to look at it, and at that, which is happening to it. Perhaps it belongs to another circle of interests still being accepted by me. But exactly that needs to be made understood.

But so much is already understandable, that the respective act acceptance has a persistence within the streaming present, or that the act indeed changes, but within this change still has something persisting as an act, as a “function” of the Ego. Considered more closely: 1) The original proper act, setting in with the Ego’s directing-itself towards something affecting and splitting itself into single acts, which constitute the act’s result in a unitarily functioning way; [47] 2) the retentional modification it already enters in its progress, insofar as the doing (like already the affecting beaming onto it), which comes from the Ego-pole emerges as a mental process, i.e. [it] takes on the temporal modes, that is, [it] has its immanent being as a continuous change of retention. Each use of an act already presupposes a streaming underground, and that which is already constituted as a unit therein; from such a unit the affection starts. But of course we restrict ourselves now to the living present’s content of something originally constituted within it, of such a thing, which emerges therein as a unit “itself”.

3) That which we call the result of the act (founding result of each subordinate act for the constitution of the total result) is the What, the intentional as such, sense of acceptance (sentence).

4) The ray of acceptance, the positing, is directed to this, in the polythetic acts to the single sentences up to that one, which is characterized as an end, as a completion[[42]](#footnote-42); the single ones build on each other or follow each other, they are connected as a unit of acceptance of a polythetic total in view of the positing-rays of a bundle of rays connected towards the unit of a total within the Ego.

5) Within the mode of the originality the rays emanate from the Ego within the processional one-after-the-other, with the distinguished application-emanation, whereby the first ray shoots forward in a primal springing way with the character of the beginning and a prior horizon pointing towards something to be further performed; and again the last ray <is> not simply the last, but [it is] <distinguished> as ending.

But within the course of this process each new ray has its point of functioning, like correlatively each sentence within the posited sentences. It is interwoven into a whole. The total sentence of such a many-memberedness may then be posited within a following (founded within the many-membered previous positing) one-ray positing. But it has not become a simple sentence therefore, and in such a way, as if it was primarily positable monothetically. The simple positing and the simple sentence is and remains a founded positing; and this means that I can go back any time (here within the living present) from the one-ray positing as an “intentional modification” of the primary to this one itself. The polythetic sentence alone is the sentence itself, is the primal and proper meaning, the one-ray positing intentionally points back to.

[48] Thus a change takes place if “I engage attention” to the sentence within a ray of regard, looking back after the formation. A change already takes place, even if that does not happen, through the mere change, taking place during the process of the proper act already by way of the immanent temporalization, and afterwards by way of the changes, which[[43]](#footnote-43) partly further proceed through it (as[[44]](#footnote-44) a change of the whole act’s mental process of an act like in the finite conclusion of the act, into a unitary retention, as a constant retentional change). But also new kinds of act-changes come into question. Spoken in a more distinct way: Up till now we only had the primal-proper activity in view, the primal and proper being-active. Directing-oneself-towards-something and being-directed, to-have-something-in-view, which for the Ego is the Whereto of the performing, that, which comes out “from” it in this Whereto and is now there itself within its mode of fulfilling means the same in a primal and proper way.

Within the course of the primal act necessarily nothing is properly there at the point of beginning; the previous affection changes into the beginning of the direction-to, which reaches the performance’s point of beginning, but now is progressing continuously until a conclusion is reached. This initially results in a simple act, the simplicity of which does not mean that it is an abstractly momentary mental process. Also the simplest grasping of a perceptional object affecting me from the background has a certain immanent-temporal breadth, in the continuity of which I receive it in a viewing way for example. This already implies a continuity of performance happening in an immanent-temporal change as a continuous synthesis of that which is performed in each phase, and this as an intentional synthesis builds a unity of that, which has been seen, “presenting” itself in different ways, etc.

If an act now proceeds in its continuity and in discretion, progressing in functioning special acts, then, as we said, continuously the retentional change takes place, and after the conclusion we have temporalized the total of the act in the form of the having-run-its-course, and thus in the form of the having-just-been, whereby each partial act and each phase of the same has its own and different having-just-been.

This implies: Each phase of these ways of temporalization employs the act of this phase as a radiating doing with its relative “result” of the Ego, but within the just-now-past, that is, the Ego is that which is past and the performance [is] that which is past, and that which has been performed as such is past.

[49]

<c)> Constituted world <The concrete Ego is as being temporalizingly temporalized directed towards the present, pregiven world>

3) If we take the normal case of all Ego’s activity, namely the originally preceding [case], from which every other case is a turning (in the widest sense “reflection”). It consists of the Ego of the living present <being> related to the primal field of perception. It is directed to, occupied by anything therein in its activity; but the occupying oneself while entering the “mentally living” and temporalizing oneself as a mental process results in the temporalization of the Ego as the one occupying itself.[[45]](#footnote-45) But this means: It is as temporalizing itself.

The primal constitutive within the primal phenomenal being of this temporalizing is: Ego, its acts temporalized within the rhythm. But apperception is always already active. There is always an affecting and not yet affecting ground, the perceptional field, where no field of memory and effects of memory <come along> breaking in, and then <form> bases for acting: The concrete being-Ego (that of the awake Ego) is the living temporalization with the Ego-pole, the center of affections and actions; pole also of the still undermined instincts, of the attunement having its special difficulties. The primal Ego and that which is originally its own is indistinguishable one with that which at first is a primarily being for it, that which has been temporalized as such, or rather, with the living temporalization, in which this is constituting itself in a unitary way (whereby it has its horizon pointing towards former temporalization which is still beyond question).

This original aliveness as a “continuous” constitution, continuous temporalization, is a temporalization through which each and everything, being the currently present for me, is, but which needs to be understood or limited in the right way. The world, being there for me, the way it is now accepted by me, is within the Now, within a temporalization belonging to it, that is, the living present. This presupposes an already constituted being sense, whereby the present world is for me a world in the mode of the now present one, and more closely, is now in an original way pregiven as a perceptional field, possibly a field of recollection, etc. And therein I am occupied in a worldly way; thereto I have thoughts, reaching into the world-horizon, empty objectivations, judgment thoughts, etc.

[50] Not only the external world is constituted, but also my body, I, man in the world, I as a man with others in connection, I as a man forming thoughts, having them as already being built [thoughts], telling them others, taken over from others or transformed after taking over, etc.

Within the living present reducing to them (unbuilding) I have the[[46]](#footnote-46) pregivenness of the world as a living-present pregivenness, exactly as it is pregivenness within this vividness. The world is pregiven – pregiven as a livingly streaming How of the total way of givenness. But thereby we need to differentiate: 1) the temporalization streaming in a primal living way, in which the “ways of appearance” of the objects, of the perceptual surrounding, etc. with all unsettled horizon-preliminary-indications and back-indications temporalize themselves immanently; and 2) exactly this immanent coexistence and succession of temporalized appearances, or rather the streams of mental processes of total appearances of the world as a whole.

Living temporalization is “performance”, is an acquisition of unities. These unities are the world appearances here, that constitute unity, spatial objects, objective duration within the mode of the How of the way of givenness as appearances-of within the same streams (primeval ones). The acquiring temporalization is not that which is temporalized, the immanent here.

But now there is the paradox that the temporalization as well temporalizes itself at the same time, that the living present itself again, as a present living present continuously transfers into a present which has just been a living one, and so on. This paradox also needs a clarification.

4) But <do I have> the Ego now, the awake of the living primal original present, as the living pole and the Ego from the temporalization as a temporal Ego? As that <it is> within the concrete temporality, the temporalized temporality, a concrete Ego, as a living present one (being now) and as a living one having “behind” itself its continuity of the modified living Egos of the present, of those having just been in their row and before itself the continuous future of its Nows.

I,[[47]](#footnote-47) within the living moment, within the primal phenomenal “streaming” being already have a pregiven field of “something being”; I have it through that, which I have in the form of a livingly present “depiction”,[[48]](#footnote-48) ways of appearance (intentionality). This as totally [laying hold of], namely laying hold of all special appearances in a unitary way, forms a unitary layer within the [51] concrete living present. In its streaming this layer streams, and within its totality, as well as according to its special appearances, it proceeds in intentional coincidence – thus we say afterwards in an explicating way, whereby we spread that which is a streaming coincidence, within an external of each other, namely as succession of appearances as appearances of the same unity. Within the primal living streaming there is no consequence of the covering “extended”; within the streaming there is a unity of coexistence, but simply in the mode of the streaming change in streaming coincidence. Within the field of being events occur, a figured succession of something emerging and passing for instance, a melody sounds. This process is not the streaming in which as a process it constitutes itself in a living way, the persisting within the continuity of the retentional changes – keeping “conscious” every tone as the one just now fading away, and then again as a [tone] fading away, while the second one sounds and sounds on, “goes back”, etc.

<d) The “breadth” of the living present within the streaming being: Beginning, ending and change of givennesses>

The[[49]](#footnote-49) process of the living spreading of the newly emerging within the living present has, when we begin to investigate our sense, already a breadth and within this breadth it has a place of the source-point Now of the breadth; this for its part is a source way for the changed breadths having sprung within the streaming away. Change in the form “ever new source-Now”, its drying up as a debouching and modifying itself into its just now, that is, in its “new” current breadth, “appearing” at later places. But within this process as a vividness of the double Now (present) the living constitution of the unity performs itself, which, if grasped actively, remains in unbroken certainty after this and that, as constantly one and the same only progressing into the past. This certainty is a living certainty – I hear the tone, I posit it as the one lasting, actively giving to me the continuous One as being continuously one[[50]](#footnote-50), grasping it and keeping it within my grip continuously, and furthermore thereby actively remaining in retention of this whole unity having come into existence or keeping it secondarily within the new performance of the further tone, etc.[[51]](#footnote-51)

[52] Within the primal phenomenal streaming we thus have the breadth of the stream layer, being presentive with regard to the breadth of some constituting being, therein the beginning of something newly emerging, <of> something new emerging through the presentation of a beginning, now changing within the streaming under coincidence of the presented. And thus <we have> this whole broad stream layer in streaming coincidence after the “supposed”, “conscious”, at the same time under the new beginning of details and streaming away of others into the dark and the lack of outstandingness.

But this streaming is “explicated” as a process.[[52]](#footnote-52) In the affective “field” (e.g. sound field) we have outstandingness, and ever again a new beginning of outstandingness, ever again “events”. On the other hand, from the Ego or egoically, although not “directed” by the Ego, we have secondary occurrences, now temporalizing themselves as mental processes, thus the Ego’s acts, but also every involuntarily emerging being affected, as well as every involuntary kinaesthesis and every analogous kinaesthetic thing in the widest sense.

These are secondary occurrences of the living present, in the concrete streaming immediately one with the appearing and the appearances of the basis of the total appearance of that which is already accepted by the Ego (or rather with the basis affecting at the lowest level, or, still more concrete, [with] the field, from which the primary affections are beaming).

The essential form of the constituting an immanent temporal sphere in a streaming way is one, and that which constitutes itself in one by way of streaming, is constituting something immanent, constituting in its modes of the Now, of the just now, etc.; and within the streaming through of these modes coexisting in the identical immanent time point to be constituted.

Within the immanent sphere the constitution of non-immanent objects takes place; A process put in scene by the Ego, that is, a kinaesthetic process “conditions” a process in the lowest, the purely hyletic sphere, being by way of pure association a field of coexistence in its hyletic fields.

The constant kinaesthetic-hyletic coexistence has taken over the “meaning” of a kinaesthetically-hyletically (egoically-non-egoically) bound Because, or rather, If – Then. <It> carries a horizon of egoical-kinaesthetic possibilities of the respective k in <itself> and a correlative horizon of “corresponding”, conditioned hyletic possibilities, or rather, the coexistence ko – ho has the horizon of the possibilities of appearances-of radiating from there as consequent of its respective [53] k and within the determinate process of [all] the k. The expectational horizon of the coming appearances – but these polarized, in continuous unitary constitution leading towards the optimum. But there is much that needs to be said.

Anyway, all transcendence-constitution in the immanence rests on certain ways of the “engaging with”, of the unvoluntarily (reactively, reflectively) and actively engaging with of the Ego. Now the Ego as such is an awake Ego, and the basis of a field of that which is already being [is] a field for the Ego and being for it only from specific egoical sources, and this needs to be clarified through a systematical unbuilding; among this, that the functioning Ego is anonymous in its functions, and that, which is being for it, is this primarily from a presentness, which for its part is intertwined with non-current kinaesthetics and maybe feelings. Egoical activity presupposes passivity – egoical passivity – and both presuppose association and pre-consciousness in the form of a basis being hyletic in the end.

<e) The function of the Ego pole in the concrete temporalization and the co-present of the others>

The egoical objectivates itself by way of reflection. It temporalizes itself in the primal associative temporalization, as I have already said, together with and unseparated from the lowest hyletic. In what way is the Ego-pole involved in this concrete temporalization?

In the streaming of the living present it is the identically persisting pole in the change of the immanent temporal occurrences. I have always said: This pure “Ego” is abstract, it is only concrete through the content of the streaming present.

The explication, the unfolding itself-within-itself of the streaming present in the form of a process, of an event proceeding within succession, is brought about again within a streaming present, that is, a continuously ensuing [present], and thus in infinity. I pursue the passive-associative unfolding-on-its-own-accord <and> explicating[-on-its-own-accord] in the explicating activity. In an actively explicating way I find a continuity (continuous succession) of modified streaming present times within the streaming present, encompassing these modifications and encompassing them as streaming mutual externality of such continuities of streaming present times; thus, whenever I wanted to further explicate.

Because, if I have explicated, then I may, while that which I have explicated is streaming and within streaming constitutes an immanent identity in a temporalizing way, overview with the Ego’s view, [54] run through. I may in every <phase> reflect on the “egoical” in a reflective way, and else quasi live in the respective present, while it changes retentionally, [I may] regard it as the one, and I can find its identity while running through the continuously different present times – the identity “streaming present” as an absolutely persisting identical form, but individual form in the change of the content. On the one hand I can then pursue present as the same, “only” changed in the mode of the temporal place Just-now, Earlier, etc., but as a continuously coherent identity with the unmodified, currently streaming present, which now is characterized in an apperceptive way as the one having the sense of such an explanation, that is, as the one, changing itself continuously in an implicit way into its Just-now, which is to be made a theme afterwards, and always is and remains identical with itself. It is streaming, identical with itself in a streaming way, with itself insofar as it streams away and streams anew, receives a content from the predelineated future, i.e., has <it> “in front of” itself as a coming new present, etc.

Is the identical, the completely concrete present (the living concrete immanent Now in its continuous, living identity of the persisting of the same living Now in this continuity as changing itself in its content, but persisting as the same changing-itself) <something> else than the same Ego, which is an identical one by being a concrete present, and it is by changing into something which has been concretely present, etc.?

And again therein: Do we not have a separation between specific Ego and Non-Ego, this belonging to me as a field though, that as the unity of the specific egoical in its living present, the identical in the subjective behavior towards the field and identically in the temporalizing change of this behavior?

But what would the specifically egoical individual form be now? [Would it be] completely different from the field’s form? Within the living present the kinaesthetics pass by, the involuntary “I move”, as well as the affections. The affections pass by and they do not have any identity in the immanent time, but are simply ever again other ones. Of course they associate themselves. But is the specific Ego a mere associative unity?[[53]](#footnote-53)

The temporalized concrete Ego, the explicated streaming, streamingly explicating itself in a passive associative way, the streaming of the retentional continuity of the Now up to the most fading Just-now.

[55] As “Now” we have something double: 1) The Now of the primal field (or rather, of the world field), therein proceeded a process for example, let us say, the chiming of a melody. Therein we have a now present tone, or rather, the now streamingly streaming away phase of a tone, from there its pasts in their succession, but as such in their modes of the Just-now. It is exactly this what makes the new point.

2) The now chiming tone is now in unity with the modes’ continuity of the Just-now. This whole continuity, in which the tone-now is a phase, has the peculiarity of the Now. This cross-continuity is the concretely living present, as a streamingly living one. Streamingly it constitutes in the living self-coincidence of its intentionality an intentional unity streaming of its own accord. Thus <for instance> that of the melody.

The now present tone is constituted as lasting, as now persisting and continually persisting, and thus every tone which has just passed as the (one, self) of its past, and the whole melody as a present, persisting and continually persisting process, identical in its time-form and in the order of its temporal locus and in its filling with a tone quality, identical in the change of the streaming changing of the temporalizing ways of appearance.

By performing this contrasting, we reflected upon the streaming and directed our view on the identical tones’ and their pasts’ (their times’) modes of appearance extending themselves within the streaming as an effect, as a process. As soon as we do this, we simply have an identical process, that of the temporalizing tone appearances, and for the whole field that of the temporalizing appearances of the whole field (of the hyletic data, or rather, of the spatial-worldly total appearances).

And does this not repeat itself again? We indeed have thereby the keeping our mind on it, which is not nothing, but [is] itself a mental process, as that in temporalization? All that has been viewed is due to its essence necessarily temporalized and within streaming temporalization, and the viewing itself in reflection <is> itself again temporalized and in temporalization.

Of course this is only time and temporalization within the vividness, and from there it the further temporalizing performance of a time[[54]](#footnote-54) being “in itself” needs to be asked, through the functioning of the re-awakening of the sunken past, of the “kinaesthetics” of the recollection, etc.

But thereby we need to consider that it is again the living past in which the primal functioning, in which the further [56] past, and likewise the future becomes obvious and understandable, takes place in its being and with the sense of the “in itself”.

Do we not then come to the conclusion that the disclosed of the sedimentation and the awakening always takes place in living present as the concrete subjectivity, and that its streaming being as some streaming constituting thing encompasses in a concentrated way each and every being for me, being in itself in its temporality-in-itself? It is simply what it is (in its way of being), as constituting in a living way, and among this, what belongs to it itself, as a possible potentiality of that constituting by which world constitution discovers itself, and world itself arrives at positive and then transcendental cognizance.

There[[55]](#footnote-55) is every other one as well, every other Ego transcendentally-streaming-being-present, constituted within me as streamingly co-present subjectivity, being concretely itself, streaming living concrete present, as well as my own temporality of the being as a past being, as a concrete streaming present is streamingly constituted within me and thus for each past. But past is simply that which has passed by and is only being as the past of present. Co-present, appresent is itself the co-source point of pasts. The other one is co-present within me. I am absolutely, as vividly streaming being concrete present, I have his present as co-present, as appresentatively-expressing-himself-as-himself-within-me, but also expresses himself as having me in self-expression within himself, constituted in his living present in the way of the co-present.

I am as a streaming present, but my being-for-me is itself constituted within this streaming present – living present is constituting itself as living present and possibly constituting itself in a scientific way. The scientifically analyzed being is at first living scientificity, and dejected in living present it is furthermore to be awakened in its potentiality, identifiable, etc.

The other one is likewise for himself, but his for-himself is at the same time my for-me, in the form of my potentiality of appresentation. But he himself is appresented in me and I [am appresented] in him. I carry all others in me as appresented and to be appresented ones themselves and as carrying myself likewise within themselves.

[57] I am the subject for everything that is, and subject for all those who again are subjects for everything that is, myself implied. The absolute subjects do not merely reflect, but they carry others themselves, but as being appresented in themselves, like I (and then everyone) carry a past being itself, but as a past one, in me.[[56]](#footnote-56) And <since> such a past is nothing without any living present (like the world is nothing with all its objective temporality as an extensive infinity, as being from a living present, and therefore present is and remains a worldly mode for it), thus the being co-present of others in the originality of empathy, a co-memory instead of a recollection, a self-memory of the others. The being of others is as a being of another living present related to my present. Co-being of others is unseparable from me within my living presentiating-oneself, and this co-present of others is founding for a worldly present, which for its part is the presupposition for the sense of all world-temporality with world-coexistence (space) and temporal succession.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Now anew. How about the “Ego”, I am, I was, I will be – worldly, in transcendental reduction: Am I something else there, I, who I am, than that which has been called a streaming (transcendental) present above? I am in the originality of this streaming life as a streaming constituting. Everything I have therein as something constituted, I accept as such and it is my remaining having – I am in relation to others, whom I persistently accept or as open potentialities for acceptances, which are to be gained and remain, and which I thus have as co-constituting, etc., so that my constituted having under the title world is a common having of the streamingly-being intersubjectivity. Included therein <is> the being of us ourselves as past, future ones, as being within the time, which remains for me and for us – constituted as remaining having in the primarily streamingly being intersubjectivity.

We have here the first concept of the Ego’s centralization, or we have the Ego as center, namely for all being of the world and for them as world-universe, and <we have the> Ego as center for all, like for worldly, like <for> immanent temporality (or rather, We as a comprehensive subjective center), namely as the Ego’s center, making the sense of temporal present, standing within the present of the time and to which the past and future time is related in a meaningful way.

[58] The world time has the sense as being only as being (present) in relation <to> the current present of the subjects, not as [subjects] contingently being present within it, but as the subjects primarily being streaming present in the primary streaming togetherness and constitutively having a world. We have (we, the streamingly being ones) this world itself in a streaming way of givenness as a streamingly present world, having streamingly its past behind itself, its future in front, and which in this streaming is and remains always identical.

The double sense of present – constituted present and constituting subjectivity as originarily arising vividness – will demand an appropriate terminology!

The past Ego, the Ego in the modes of the Just-now in the present Ego, the Ego-ray of activity directed towards the persisting unity; it persists, it lasts in the streaming of the ways of appearance. – Ambiguous: The standing point of the Now and its tail of the Just-Now as modifications of the former Now-points, this point of the “streaming” like the tail is “streaming”, streamingly living present. The form of the streaming is not streaming as present with its point of form Now, the unity and form continuity of the Just-now. The fulfilled form is streaming, i.e. the primal phenomenon, and to this belongs the multi-dimensionality displayed by me, which is itself a streaming one and has as multi-dimensionality as well a “persisting”, namely a non-streaming form.

But the Ego has a present, a constituted present, an experiential field. How does it have this? It has as a “core” the primal perceptual present. It also has within its present a past and thereby a primarily represented, primarily remembered [past]. It has a primal Just-now. It has a primarily constituted ont<ic> present as a lasting [present], persisting in an unchanged way, as lasting in change, thus it has a persisting coexistence in change and unchange. It has the entering into the present, the passing by, exiting, processes, successions of unities. Change – in explication, features emerge, disappear according to a continuous change.

The Ego, I who I am, “within” the streaming present, the field of perception “in the eye”, as perceptually there, therein the view directed towards this and that, streaming-streaming away. That which is unitary within the streaming, the rays thereto, to one, something persisting, a persisting ray. The one thing persisting as lasting, the one ray lasting. “Then” a new unity, but the ray [is] modified.

[59] If the streamingly living subjectivity owns its constituted world then it is in a certain sense and quasi double. As a streaming presentation and worldly constituted as streamingly worldly it is being present and middle of both branches of the oriented time, past – future.

But now we go over to distinguish from the concrete transcendental subjectivity the transcendental Ego, from the concrete being as something streaming present (the transcendental, that is the “soul” understood as absolute), the transcendental Ego, the transcendental or absolute one, corresponding to the human person in the mature man, in the “undeveloped” child, that is, the δύν<αμις>. I, the man bethinking myself, find myself in transcendental reduction as a (completely developed) transcendental Ego. What is that? As an awake, streamingly present “soul” or a concretely complete Ego I am an awake soul through the specific egoical structure in contrast to the structure of the pre-givenness of the world. Or rather: The transcendental Ego is something relative, an egoical structure in contrast to that, which is pregiven to the Ego, and with which it is occupied as an Ego and at what and with which it busies itself.

The transcendentally-phenomenlogically focused Ego is an Ego of a higher level which has pregiven the natural Ego and the world phenomenon as that which is <to be> regarded.

In the livingly primarily streaming soul, the awake one, we have the livingly primal streaming Ego. The “soul” itself is called a concrete Ego, because a soul, if it is a pure theme, is apperceived in the direction of the Ego (having a special egoical life within), whereby its basis is of course there as well and possibly will be thematic as a basis of the same.

To this egoical life the being affected belongs, being more or less driven there from the affecting, attracted and listening in answer, that is, applying one’s attention and engage in that which is pregiven, in one’s way livingly-pre-egoically within the basic layer <of the> constituting. This constituting-oneself-as-I is not to be understood as a self-giving of the perception or recollection.

A complementing regard is missing here as such. 1) We have a primal constitution within the patent streaming soul, and of course we know of it through activity. A higher-level knowledge already presupposing this patence is that of the sphere of the “unconscious”, <a> knowledge uncovering the sedimented sphere – and there as well we need to speak of a primal constitution if we may say that the sedimented intentionality goes on in a temporalizing way. Secondly [60] we then have the awakening, vitalization. The awakened object as such constitutes itself in it, a piece of a living constitution, and then it possibly goes over into a recollection. Here the Ego comes into question with its waking intentionality. The being awakened can take place within the extra-egoical sphere of vividness, as an awakening through association (co-determined by an egoically living interest). But the Ego is awakened for this awakened object, it is affected and turns itself to, it includes the remembered into its occupation.

Here the affection towards the Ego connects to the action and then possibly ever new action, and thus the Egoical as such has a special connection. By saying this we already have the temporal explication in view, the temporalization always gives a streaming extension in the living soul in the streaming being, as a series of events. But in the livingly presenting present I do not have a mere succession, but the primal streaming Now and the acts having streamed away have not only streamed away, pasts, but are accepted now, modified in their way of temporalization and past as past present – but that, which they have posited, is now “in the grip”, is now “still” something that has been posited.

Thus in the primal streaming concrete Now, the soul, not only original rays of acceptance or positing and retentional changes of such ones do lie as streaming moments of mental processes, but “persisting” ones, namely settings of the Now persisting through these changes. Temporally seen in an extensive way this is a succession, insofar [it is] within the streaming being. Within the standing and remaining Now, which is only called thus as a living streaming Now, is each change of a positing beginning anew a living change, in which though the changed positing is an “actual” positing within the Now.

What does this “actual” mean? Of course here the modalizations come into question. This Egoical called an act (related to preceding affections), has different modalities. Among them [it has] a primal mode certainty.

(I now find myself faced with the question how the separation of a specific Ego as a unity of specifically egoical affections and actions takes place in the living present. The questions remains with the mere approach:)

[61]

<f) Which part of the world is present to us, which [part] of it is presented?>

On the one hand I as an awake Ego have the world field which is “present” to me within the living present – in a usual way of speaking this does not mean the realm of the world (of that being accepted by me), which is conscious to me as a temporally present world, or rather, as that which is currently conscious to me of the temporally present one. I can right now <let> some past worldly object, a realm of a past world present be “present” in the form of recollections. We often declare ourselves thus, that is, with regard to the worldly past: “ This is not present to me”, “This is no longer present to me”, that is, in the sense: “With regard to the – past – world this is actually conscious to me (remembered) or not in my living present.

“’Present’ of the world” – there we thus need to distinguish. I, conscious of the world, say: Whenever I investigate sense, I am conscious of the world. This implies that I am able to presentiate in my living present other living present times, present ones, but freely changed past ones, future ones or in these modes changed ones. Thereby the living present is changed in such a way, that I have distinguished in it and in one: present which is not a presentiated one (and as that conscious in a modified way), and presentiated present, whereby the presentiation and the presentiated as such itself enters as well, or rather, belongs to the not presentiated as well, the current present.

If I say and perform in general: I can presentiate to myself in every living present other living present times, freely conceived ones or remembered ones, etc., then it becomes clear, that I thereby do not only have one or multiple singular presentiations in the living present, but a “consciousness of a universality” explicating itself in them, and that this “universal meaning” and the universal itself supposed therein emerges in my living present. And again it is clear that all these modifications of presentiation, the change of the optional character (of the “thinking-to-oneself”), the general opinion, can also emerge as presentiated ones in presentiations, or rather, that in my living present I can freely imagine presentiations, in which other presentiations are presentiated, in which they are examples for presentiated universalities, universalities which are now conscious as such, which are thought ones in an actual or possible recollection [62], meant ones in the remembered living present in a “back then” general meaning, etc.

All modifications of living present questionable here and ways of consciousness being current therein can emerge iteratively, nested in ever new steps, but in the modification of the nesting itself belonging as well into that of the living present, which is now indeed <present> and an unmodified one, which makes my current awakeness.

No.14

<Being-at-the-same-time and spatial co-existing before the background of the rigid temporal form>[[58]](#footnote-58)

The[[59]](#footnote-59) subjective perception of the unitary time order happens in rigid regularity in such a way, 1) that a currently living present with Now, Just-now and Coming keeps this form rigidly in a streaming change (primal streamingly); but each phase streams away, the Now into the Just-now, the Just-now into the further Just-now, “continuously”, the “coming” into that of the ever further presentingly coming up into the being-at-the-moment, being-now. In this streaming at first a unity constitutes itself in the frame of a living present by way of a unifying coincidence, “the same”,[[60]](#footnote-60) in the changing modes of the future, of the Now, of the past, which though streams away in this selfness within the streaming away itself, disappearing from the “field of sight” of the whole living present (as a “field of perception”). But it is always a fulfilled field of perception, that is, the being thereby can either last continuously, that is, evermore emerge in new phases of the Now and the Future and thus temporalize ever new phases of its duration (duration of present) – or it can end. But the field of present is further filled by something else, which is unitarily a present being, which has in advance already been present as well and perceived as well, or which at the same time begins with [63] the lasting of the one; The perceptual field of present encompasses as lasting something being n the at-the-same-time. At the same time means for two beings that they both do last, they last in that each one, viewed in an abstract way, is a primal springing up Now with its livingly streaming beennesses and futurenesses. But thereby not the whole form of the one and the other needs <to> coincide, insofar as the one has begun earlier, the other one later, and then again the one, be it later or earlier stops.

In this living streaming, in which the perceptual field of present keeps its rigid form, that of the identical temporality of present in its primal form, and constitutes as streaming objective present in the streaming change of the filling contents of these modes, the objective sinks and yet it remains as being, while at the same time some new being enters the field.

It remains – in the present sphere recollection can emerge as a mode of the coming-back-again to that which is no longer present and again is grasped within the streaming. The recollection can repeat itself in the living present (in arbitrary activity as well) and every [recollection] comes back to the same, although to the same in different pasts as simply always vanishing in a streaming way.

This form of the possible identifying and ever-again-identifying through reawakening recollections coming back to the same is also a rigid regularity.

Thus we have a streaming time being present and presentiated to us, with a horizon, a potentiality of open possible further presentiations, in which every worldly object being for us comes to the primal consciousness (with the essentially corresponding founding steps of this originality, as a primary and a secondary one respectively).

But within this form of the streaming subjective happening, in which I alone have and can have a world, a difference is brought about within the content in the way of the streaming through of the form, that, which we call change and unchange. But before that something important is lacking.

But the rigid form of the streaming present has two sides:

1) the one we have described is the form of the primal springing point of present and of the continuity of its pasts and futures; but <a> second form structure concerns the coexistence.

ad 1) The respective being has its duration, as the successive unit of the time points, each of which has sprung from the streaming change of the content in the form Now into the same content in the form Just-now, etc., [64] or rather, through the change of the concrete Now (filled with a content) into the concrete Now which has been, while at the same time a new Now with a new content is attached.

The duration is a series of time points, each of which has its richness, and thus it is the object’s duration. But many objects last and the duration of all objects, standing in the unity of the streaming present, belongs to one and the same manifoldness of time (succession) as a stretching, streamingly constituting itself. This is identically one, the duration of two objects are stretches in the same manifoldness of time points and respectively they are disjunctive stretches or stretches having a part identically in common. The same stretch can thus have different fillings, through which the same duration or parts of duration can at the same time be this and at the same time that object.

All objects, belonging to one and the same present, are within it by way of their duration either in a separate succession or in a partial at-the-same-time, which is partially a succession, or in a complete at-the-same-time, insofar as they agree in each point of their duration, and thus have identically the same total duration.

The spatiality’s form of co-existence belongs to the essential possibility of this kind of objective co-existence in the living present and then in general in the present objectively constituting itself, and especially [it belongs] to the essential possibility for multiple world objects co-existing in any stretch of the one time and thereby can occupy the same time points and time stretches with the same objective content. The object’s fullness, its temporal what-content, has a “spatial extension” in each of its time points. This implies that every object has at every time point within itself a realm of contemporaneity; its fullness in this time moment is distributed on mutual externality, that is, again <on> a constant one, to be cognized as a point-manifoldness of multiple dimensions.

And it is this mutual externality, which enables the same time-points to have multiple fullnesses, the same object to have contents of the at-the-same-time, simply only in the extensive spatial mutual externality.

The determinate mutual externality, the spatial form of the object, is here thought of as a co-fullness of the time-point. In the continuity of the duration (springing from the lasting) the filling can, and thus also the spatial form can [do] nothing else but continuously fulfill the duration, whether it remains continuously the same from point to point, or, if the form of the mutual externality permits this, (which we have not analyzed yet) changes continuously.

[65] Contemporaneity of multiple objects, each [contemporaneity] with its duration and already with its own inner contemporaneity as extension, now again becomes possible or has its essence in that the [contemporaenity] of one or the other of the corresponding spatial extensions of stretching (forms) are mutually external. The mutual externality excludes the identity in any time-point, in any time stretch, that is, *eo ipso* also the identity of any part of spatial stretching of one or the other object.

The total time with the allness of the time objects belonging to it thus has the peculiarity, that a unitary mutual externality belongs to each time-point, in which all single object’s forms, extensions take their place. All momentary extensions, as belonging to unitarily lasting objects, need to fulfill the requirements of the continuity in the continuity of the time. No other object can ever have the same spatial extension that an object has in the continuity of its duration. But why do we say the same and not the similar one? Or the other way round: Is it not a matter of course that that, which is peculiar to the one must be different from that of the other one; thus the fullness, the What of one is at the very best similar to that of the other one. But is not the time-point and the time duration that of one and again that of the other object and yet identically one?

No.15

<The streaming change in the world present being at the same time>

The streaming constituting a succession as a temporal being of constituting a world is in a certain identifying continuous coincidence. We regard the performance of this process abstractively if we exclusively direct the view on the way the structure of the stream phases according to the Now and the just-nownesses in the streaming transfers the fulfilled Now into its pasts and the pasts in the stream phase into their pasts, etc. Namely in such a way that we do not further ask for the structure of the Now (and then of all pasts, etc.), for that, which already concerns the content thus. As soon as we do that, as soon as we thus ask for the now together, for the now being at the same time, we grasp a new side, in which the same streaming, the temporalizing, <temporalizes> something real. Regarded in a formal way we have constituted in one with the objective succession and in it an objective at-the-same-time and within the at-the-same-time a being unified; or a lasting being of objects as [66] being at the same time and of objects already carrying within themselves an at-the-same-time in the way of parts, of pieces being dependent though but still of the same kind, like independent objects. With the help of the form structure of the mutual externality in the objective temporality which leaves open[[61]](#footnote-61) a multiplicity in every phase, namely the space form being identical in the temporalizing streaming and belonging to every Now, <it> is streamed through so to say by the content in the generally temporalizing streaming.

The space form rigidly-remaining is a multi-dimensional manifoldness, in one with the successive manifoldness in the way of a unitary manifoldness of which the time is one dimension. Within the streaming of the temporalizing the streaming of the objective something being now present is <mentally lived> as a change of this presentness while keeping the objective identity. But this identity is not simply an identity of the present time content. These are the objects in a temporal How, objects in respective “states”. In the temporalizing transition of present into new present the objective state goes over into a new objective state, into a synthetical continuity, by the help of which the same real constitutes itself therein. This transition on the one hand is a transition into new spatial points (motion and deformation) and a transition from fullness of the spatiotemporal form into new fullness, as a change of the state, as a change of the same.

Let us, living in the experience, try at first to keep the view strictly on the streaming of time-worldly modalities and their worldly synthesis, in which the world has its world time. In every momentary-Now of the world-present’s streaming, of the concretely unified one in the streaming, we have a continuity of phases. The momentary-Now is the phase of the streaming. This phase has the manifold as its content, which is in this moment, now, “at the same time”, and this at-the-same-time is the at-the-same-time within the streaming, that is, the being-in-the-same-mode-of-the-streaming, that of the Now.

In this primal mode of the streaming we have in one “at the same time” in a worldly way, the world being now with the time modalities belonging to this Now, that is, the whole continuum of the time modalities.

We thus have as a single phase in this continuously-unitary at-the-same-time[[62]](#footnote-62) a Now, the world-Now, the Now of the all-temporal world, [67] as of its present, apart from the other phases within the at-the-same-time, that part of it which belongs to it as its being now-past and its coming-in future.

If we regard the world-now, that is, the moment of the (perceptively-intuitional) world-present, then it is a mutual externality, in which the distinguishable is at the same time, - at the same time belonging to the world present.

This at-the-same-time is within the streaming, which constitutes an objective time of succession within the identification continuously governing in it, and contemporaneity in every time-point. On the other hand it implies something different, which is at the same time, and the being at the same time of something different persists in the streaming.[[63]](#footnote-63)

All worldly being in an original present, that is, being now-at-the-same-time keeps some space for itself in a universal form. All details are not only different, but mutually external within space. Within the streaming of the time modalities the uniform time world constitutes itself and not as a rigid world, which repeated only absolutely identically the same in all time-points, that is, in all present times that have been and will be. Rather, the world within the stream of time modalities is a world of identically “persisting” being, of real substances, persisting in the changes of the being. All this world has its beings, but the rigid form of the spatiotemporality, a rigid time of succession, the time of something really being, <being ones>, which as such are spatial with an identically remaining space.

[68]

No.16

<Note: On different methods and steps of reduction>

1) The[[64]](#footnote-64) world phenomenon reduced to primordiality. Method: To switch off the sense layers, which others presuppose. The sense layers of the primordial world – nature no body; final things of a higher step. Nature presupposes a body, but body is also nature. They are somehow intertwined. The phenomenon of the reduced world – in living present, unity of streaming manifoldness. How <can> this be intentionally “analyzed”? Manifoldness of appearances, world appearances, the appearing world as such, as phenomenon, as sense of acceptance, being accepted by me as manifoldness of things, realities. Primordial: persisting, remaining space temporality as form; multiplicity of realities, [of] the “world objects”; at first pure as the world appears in the streaming-living present, and that which appears therein: 1) What does this “appears” mean? Perceptional sphere, reduction to that which offers perception. 2) Sense layers of another kind dimmed. What is “self-given” there? Worldly, streaming world of perception, univocal in itself possibly with corrections; overview of the world phenomena’s stream. – 3) Founding before: My Ego in its immanent life and my self-temporalization, which I can perform as a consequent self-acceptance; thus reduction to the primal streaming life and the Ego as living, busying itself, but also that which makes it thematic as a phenomenologizing <Ego>, performs activities, cognizes, and cognizes that its acts themselves fit into the streaming life, etc.

Thus steps of reduction: 1) Primal stream.

2) Within the primal stream intentionality as making the world conscious through appearances and other opinions, ways of consciousness of the world, unifying themselves synthetically within streaming – world persisting through correction in the overview over the stream.

Continuing acceptance, habituality, annulled acceptance of that, which itself comes to acceptance anew within the streaming – on the other hand annulled acceptance, which is merely a continuing acceptance from previous times. Perception as self-giving, as verifying and infirming.

Reduction to the intentionality of the perception. Unity of a living present as a living world present, a world field (“extract”) [69] self-giving – that which is perceived of the world in the living present. That <which> in some continuity of living present times (that is, by way of recollections), (then pre-memories and memories of co-present) has become and <is> becoming conscious of the world in a perceptional way; pre-intuition of the world as future, as presumably coming and as co-present, but not perceptional present, <the> anticipated in every perceptional present. – But this already belongs to the analysis of the perceptional present.

The world as plurality, streaming perceptional plurality of realities, single reality or groups of reality persisting in the perception within the change of appearances; in the change unity, unity of the real, persisting with the sense in unchange and change. The unity experienced in the change can – in the change – be perceived as a change (e.g. motion), but in such a way, that the same and similar change is perceptible in different subjective changes; the changes of perception in a double form, proceeding on their own accord, without my interfering or brought into play by me, thus for silence, thus for change and for everything, which is and remains “objectively” accepted.

Appearances and changes of appearance, stream of appearances. Appearance does not mean primal streaming “life”, but object-in-the-How being conscious in the streaming life. For instance an object as an object nearby, an object as a far-away object. Objective, matter-of-fact determinations of the thing as those in which it is accepted as itself, and “subjective” determinations of the thing as appearing to me in the immanent time, to me just now, now thus and thus, appearances themselves, as a unity of acceptance and verification.

Step-wise implication, the unity of acceptance “object in the How” can itself again be founded in “objects in the How” of a lower step (appearances in appearances). Analysis of the founding steps: The final sense thing is founded step-wise, it has a sense, a being sense as lower step. The last being is a unity of relative being things, which do not yet arrive at the sense of being worldly.

Necessary: Transition of the intentional explication of the final sense “world” into its sense steps. Regressive analysis of the sense (analysis of the sense-giving, the sense-cumulation) and progressive setup, progressive exploration of how the sense is a being sense, to be thought of as closed, and indeed being closed always functioning, synthesis of the univocality of manifold appearances.

[70]

No.17

On the setup of the living present according to impressional, reproductive fields. Interest

<a> aspects of the living present: hyle, act, intentionality, presentation and presentiation>

At first the further concept of the living present, the current one in its difficult structure from the hidden immanent-associative temporalization (the inactive one); in the current streaming we differ as lowest structure: 1) the hyletic core (hyle then distinguishable into primal hyle (hyle in the older sense of the *ideas*) and hyle in an enlarged sense of the impressionally or perceptually appearing in a worldly way as such)[[65]](#footnote-65) – of that being from activity, as will be shown later; 2) the egoical “directions” reaching into the core and especially in any components of the same, act-intentionalities (“interests”).

But the title hyle in the enlarged sense leads to the constitutive, in which itself lies “subdued” activity, changed into secondary passivity.

3) Acts essentially belong to the living present (in the awake Ego) in the form of living acts within the primal mode of the performance and modifications of actuality of the kind as sinking and keeping acts, living acts in the still-performance, which are “still” being performed, still posit, still keep in their grip, or dismissed for the grip.[[66]](#footnote-66)

Sub 2): In the primal present there are acts as well, but acts do not need to be originally living. I can be sunken into memories, and not directed towards anything in a final, final original, primal current way, e.g. be occupied with nothing from the living present hyle. But this is of the kind of the apprehension data of the appearing perceptional present of the surrounding world, with its transcending apperceptions. On the other hand then final original primal current acts as well belong to the living present of the awake Ego [71] anyway, namely those admitting themselves into its past and future or into the “co”-present and again into the other “possible experiences”, namely those belonging to my actual past and future, and eventually the newly stepped realm of the “empathy”, the presentiation of the others and their living present, etc.

Thus we now need to explicitly distinguish as a content of the primal living present; the terminology is rather difficult here.

The primal, current Ego as Ego-pole of the current present.

1. That which is primarily-directly accessible for it, the primal present, the core, the impressional present, that, on which it possibly primarily grasps in a straight-forward way, with which it likewise occupies itself, - that which is present for it in the first sense.
2. But the Ego in its acts (and actuality’s modifications of its acts) is conscious of itself and of these acts, and can reflect on them in new current (reflecting) acts. They then form its secondary present and become knowable as being concretely one with the primal impressional core and thus together with it yield an enlarged impressional present. Impression – that which is not reproduced.
3. Then the contents of different kinds and different steps of presentiations belonging to the living present – thus a “reproduction” contrasts itself in its impression.

As reproductions they belong to the present and are accessible for the Ego by the help of reflective acts. Everything present is perceptually given and possibly perceived in an attentively perceiving way, and thus the reproductions as well. If one calls the impressional that which is thus present, the perceptual, then we have within the widest concept of impression the separation between impression in the closest sense (non-reproduction) and reproduction.

But not only the reproductions are accessible. They reproduce, represent the non-present, the non-impressional. They fall into primordial original reproductions (of something proper, of my own) and into “empathizing”, understanding reproductions. All primal reproduction reproduces a concrete impression, that is, as originally my “former” one, with my Ego, my affections and actions, my impressional core, etc: - all in the mode of the formerly past, not of the retentionally past (of the Just-Now), which above that explicitly constitutes itself for me as being past through the transition into a respective reproduction (recollection).

[72] But simply this draws the attention to the need to distinguish in the self-reproductions as being original between reproductions of something, which has ended just now, of the retention, also of the farther away retention being already empty, and of the past in the common sense of that which already “lies behind me”, the far away, that, which has already become “lifeless”.[[67]](#footnote-67) This living and lifeless needs to be described more accurately. The present reaches thus far, as we can still speak of a “current” truth for us. But this has a different meaning, different ranges, and mainly relates to practice. We can at any time look back on that which is still current, while we are interested and active in the present, the solid one, like on <a> Just-now continuously belonging to it, still coming into consideration for our current interest, etc. More on this later.

The representation as such of my primal impression, that is, by way of recollection, yields as presentiated the former core, the Ego acts related to that, etc., but also the Ego’s abilities being referable to that. But also my current abilities come into question, insofar as I now have trained abilities of reflection, I did not yet have “back then” and by which I can only accomplish the fundamental performance of reflection within the recollection, the calling into play of possible “past perceptions” and possible (past possible) recollections, etc.

Also with view on the reproduction of future, the pre-memorizing, we seemingly have differences between the near future, which according to the special concept of living present still belongs to it or does not belong to it – and the further future.

It is of importance that in contrasting primary, primordial (original, as reproducing something peculiar to me) and empathizing reproductions, recollection and anticipations are indeed equivalent, but that the recollections reproduce in a more original way than the anticipations, as which they are pre-depicting.

On the realm of “empathyzing” we have again many differences of originality, thus within empathy itself (the analogizing appresenting of others) and in the apperceptions constituting themselves by way of this empathy. After all the concept of apperception needs to be considered more closely in relation to the above differentiations made only tentatively.

[73]

<b) The aspect of the practical interests: The formation of the correlation of interests and world-objects begins within the instinctive intentionality of the “first childhood” within the mother’s womb>

If we consider the practical temporalizations, the practically understood “present”, past and future. The practical present, the present for the man as person within the personal existence is the realm of the interest being current and currently having an impact in its complex synthetic unity. This implies that, which one is intending right now, which one is currently considering in order to decide at first, that which one is planning, after having reached a decision by pondering the different possible ways, also according to its qualities, its bigger or smaller efforts, etc. <it implies> likewise that, which one <performs> while acting currently, continuously and encompassing the results in a synthetically unified performance – all this with the respective relevances and irrelevances.

Thereby one also has interests, which are postponed, older, lacking an impact up till now, and continuingly accepted interests, with regard to which many things from the living stream of the streamingly mundane present “gain interest”. It is especially conspicuous, taken into and kept in view. It is “memorized”, taken into “memory”, “imprinted” as something being out of the question now with regard to the momentarily current interest, but still for the former one, etc.

Does it make any sense to distinguish: interest in something being, in something, which is supposed to be, or interests in the being, interests of the mind, practical interests? What are acts of the interest? Is a momentarily perceiving an act of interest in the being? One also speaks of momentary interests. An “object” momentarily raises my interest. It does not remain, I let it go, and this does not mean: to follow another interest more readily now – as if I “postpone” the interest for that object while keeping it. I let it go, I do not keep it in my interest, thus rather I let the interest go, let it dissipate. But is this not relative? Of course there is some “relativity” here. Interest as such is now a less preferable, now a preferable interest. “Interesting” is that, which is enabled to raise and to keep a preferable interest, and which does this when it is “grasped”. According to Goethe “The whole human life is interesting, wherever you grasp it.”

Is not the world, “our” world, interesting as such, although not for everybody, and <not> always of an actual preferable interest? On the other hand [74] is it as a universal [world], as this our individual world in its open indeterminacy and yet individual determinacy, not the universal field of all special interests and as that within the interest itself?

But there is a serious need to ask: Does being, and does the value, the purpose and the means, all that being there for us as something being (is it called something being as being?), precede, which the interest should follow, - or is something being always already a correlate of an interest? This would mean: The constitution of something being, of objects (which are or are conscious in modalities of being) is nothing else but a constitution of interests. World pregivenness does mean: A universal interest is instituted and furthermore an individual form of all interests. “Intentionality” precedes within the “Genesis”.

If one defines “intentional mental processes” (psychic phenomena of Brentano) as mental processes, in which the “Ego is related to an “intentional object””, and if one thereby considers, that there is always a being under the title object (or a modality of a being) (against Brentano!), then this definition, at least regarding its type (in which it could be shaped in different ways), only corresponds to the conscious life of man within humanity and of humanity within the world pregiven to all.[[68]](#footnote-68)

We say of the “first” childhood, that in it and for it, the “concept of a world” first needs to be developed; and concept of a world here means the world already accepted by the child of the second childhood, as that, which is already being respectively, the surrounding world into which it lives, into whose direction it lives, rates, strives, regards, etc., and in which it is, in which the others already are as objects, and on which the other subjects of the living into, the operating into, being occupied are as subjects, who in the togetherness, the child included, constitute some ever new being, shape the world ever anew.

But does the child in its first childhood not have any interest, any being at all? Its world, its Ego, performs itself within it and his streaming concrete present is the mother’s womb so to say, in which from an embryonic primordial germ cell through embryonic steps finally the first childhood world develops and is born.

The world itself thus has a childhood and grows to a mature world – “within” the human child and in its human growth – but certainly the [75] world constitution is not an object for this single growing up man, but for the intersubjectivity of growing up and already grown up men – whereby the game, analogically speaking, repeats itself.

That which interests us here: we already have an instinctive intentionality before an intentionality of interests with regard to something being in the proper and in the whole sense in the child of the first childhood period. But soon <it performs the> formation of interests, from remainingly being and ever new apperceptions according to the relatively being. Instituting of apperceptive types, stepwise, without awaiting a whole being; thus preliminary stages of a remaining being, of a being out of interest, whereby the interest modifies itself intentionally, insofar as the apperception functions, and the interest only emerges as fleeting or as mere affection. Therefore concrete analyses were needed.

But thus proceeding first of all some room remains for different steps and apart from something already being (at least of an actual preliminary stage) also intentionality, which has not been shaped thus yet. But the performance of the first childhood is: the pregiven universe of being as universe of all already being and in the whole time as a horizon of being, the universe of all formations of interest, which already are and will be, the universe of all natural interests of the Ego. As well organizations of interests – differences of the finished interests, the remaining having (the already being) und the proper interests, those of the lasting intentions, of the purposes and systems of purpose, life purposes, and of the special havings related to them as ready and kept handy means with the preferring awakenings, and of the living purpose systems, the intentions guiding personality.

The already being world – the universe of the respective finished. But we have a double habituality: the habituality of the already being and the habituality of the still guiding purposes <and> life purposes guiding us as human persons and authentic men as purpose systems, as purpose horizons and act horizons, frames for systems of future actions. The concept horizon is split as well. Horizon of the situation – a life interest is woken as horizon, in which the momentary actions keep themselves; in another way the whole world horizon is woken, insofar as world is always there.

Important and farther-reaching differentiations and analyses belong here.

[76]

No.18

<Note: On the unity, continuity and collision of sense fields>[[69]](#footnote-69)

The[[70]](#footnote-70) recollection made intuitional reproduces a former field of perception, which associatively coincides with the current field of perception. These two intuitions are incompatible in the living immanent present. If one [of them] is there, it pushes the other one down into the hiding.

But this is a phenomenon, which needs to be questioned sufficiently first of all. If we pay attention to the co-existing and as that associatively constituted sense fields, to the streaming which is temporalizing for them and to the constituted successions, <which> by the help of their persisting form <are> in associative coincidence, and thereby <are> a unity of a streaming, a two-sided one, and of a succession with continuous simultaneity of both sides.[[71]](#footnote-71)

The heterogenous cannot disturb itself. Heterogenity means that no simultaneous coincidence (similarity) takes place. “Conflict” presupposes a coincidence, above all a temporal coincidence, springing from the form of temporalization, coinciding in complete sameness. Coincidence of the content, the similarity (or rather sameness) of that, which is simultaneous as temporal unity “here and there”. A conflict is thus possible between something optical and something optical, two cases, fusion and conflict.

Within the primal streaming standing present, the absolute life of my Ego, we have a primal fusion, founding a unity, and a primal separation (primal contrasting, primal ununifying), which does not found any unity, but distance of unities, multiplicity in the synergy with the melting creating a unity.

It belongs to the primitive structure of the primal phenomenal life (the originally streaming one), that as temporalizing streaming it is a streaming “primal coexistence”, that is, being this [it is] a continuous simultaneous fusion, which in the form of the primal Now, retentionally just now, protentionally coming is in continuous adumbration. In the streaming this primal time field coincides continuously in [77] its form, that is, in congruent coincidence (perfect likeness). And at the same time that intentional fusion runs through the retentional changes within the streaming, which in continuous coincidence constitutes the first time as a form of unities. This continuous coincidence though is of such a kind, that it constitutes unities of change and unchange.

But such unities can only constitute themselves and a time form of these unities, that is, a form, in which simultaneous and successive unities persisting as unchanged and changed (persisting in changeability), as being, <can only> constitute themselves, if in every concrete life present the form of the primal Now is a form for a content-simultaneous fusion, the unity of a continuity: a field, for example the optical field. We need to distinguish form and content here: The form of the simultaneous fusion, in which all phases are primal impressional, preserves itself in the successive coincidence (changed in all retentions, thus also in their simultaneous continuity), in rigid coincidence, while the content changes. The distinction of the form has its basis exactly in that as a single one being always the same it is there and graspable (like every form, which as belonging to temporalization constitutes itself as a time of a different step, as time of succession, and as simultaneous time).

The form is a form for some content by discontinuity which <is> possible on the ground of an ongoing continuity. The simultaneous fusion, the simultaneous unity of a continuous change making up the optical momentary field, constitutes within streaming the field form as a continuum of the place, if one may already speak of “places” here, since places are only places for unitary objects having a place, possibly change the place, are at different places and are the same in them, like or unlike, etc. It needs to be asked, whether form of a simultaneous continuity of similarity already says it all. Within this form now there is content. What new does this imply? Within the field a date is made prominent for itself, a discontinuity, a break of continuity is distinguished, a special continuity begins and is again broken itself.

[78]

No.19

Constitution of “immanent” data, or rather, of an immanent time field. <The streaming duration in the form of change>

Immanent[[72]](#footnote-72) data are originally given in the immanent perceiving, they themselves so to say emerge therein in person. Thus one may say: “They are really implied in the perceiving-them”, similarly as in a whole, like a physical [whole], its physical parts are contained. Likewise I still said in the *ideas*.

Yet one needs to be more cautious and to heed that the real inexistence, as the example of the physical inexistence illustrates[[73]](#footnote-73), is completely different from the “intentional” inexistence of the perceived in the perception “of” it. If we abstract from the difference between perceiving perception (in which I am thematically directed towards the perceived and grasp it as being present itself) and the not perceiving perception, in which the perceived seems to be present itself, but is not grasped, then anyway perception is a concrete mental process in the form “streaming perception”, in which the perceived for its part presents itself streamingly as itself (original presentation). If we take as an example for something immanently perceived something purely subjective! It is concrete present.[[74]](#footnote-74)

Without entering into deeper analyses here, we immediately know that within the streaming there is only one phase most properly present, the phase of the primal presence, and by streaming away, [it] thereby goes over into a new mode, that of the having-just-been-present. The duration is within the concrete perception, in the stream of primal presenting phases, as duration indeed a present, perceived duration, but still a being present with moments and stretches of having flown away, which <is> in one with the respectively primal present phase a having-just-now-beenness; and it is clear that it can essentially be present itself only in such a way, as in the living stream, by changing the primal presence into modes of the just-now, which form a continuum, [79] but itself a changing one, of the Just-now, and thus still produce a present, that of the streaming duration in its primal present being. The streaming perception is in every phase of its streaming a changed one; in every [phase] the perceived is not only as something lasting-along, but as that it is perceptual, it is as itself presently given, but as that it “builds” itself phase for phase in the streaming perceiving-along.[[75]](#footnote-75) Its self-present, its self-existence is originally temporalizing itself, and this means, bringing to presence phase for phase within the streaming, whereby though the duration itself comes to presence as a streaming further duration.

Thereby, as we see, the coming-to-presence of the phases and their now-being-present, but also the coming-to-presence of the duration itself and its being present are set apart; in the same way both differences are distinguished from each other. It is also clear that all this and, as we are about to see, something further more, must well be taken into account itself as something perceived, as something belonging-to-the-perceptual-present, while at the same time exactly this shifts its sense. The presence of the duration, in its essential character as a further duration, as a lasting along of the emotion in streamingly-living duration, <is> not a rigid dead existence, in which all phases in the continuity of the duration are and remain already with the self-existence. The living present duration is “living” in the form of the primal fact of the change, of the change emerging itself as a perceptual presence, that is, in original givenness, in which many things need to be made prominent. The duration present within this change of the streaming duration is more closely characterized in such a peculiar way, that it appears as an extension, but “respectively” in one phase only “actually and properly” presents itself as being present. But this phase of the now actualized is a “primal springing” phase. Its being-now is a being within the springing-up and drying up, and thereby in such a way that the drying up means a constant modifying changing that which is actually and properly present (the primal present being-now) into something not being primal present any more, into a having-just-been, whereby though at the same time and continuously a new primal present follows, springing up and likewise again drying up and which is again accompanied by a new one in the mode of the primal springing Now and so on. This “change” now taking place in the form of the primal presence, this “streaming over” of something primal present into something primal present in the original consciousness of the persisting form Now, and again the corresponding streaming away of the primal present into [80] its having-just-been, but also this having-just-been into its having-been-just-having-been (into a modified having been as a farther away having just been), persisting likewise in an identical form, constitutes “in an ongoing way” the livingly streaming duration as an original present [duration]. The one, the individual, identical duration is constituted in such a way that in the persisting form of a primal springing Now and of dried up beennesses, the primal springings having streamed away, the same duration appears in a primal development through ongoing springing and drying up as a living present development, while at every moment the stretch of duration which has already been developed within the development, that, which has been actualized of it, “presents” itself in the persisting form, but yet with ever new “ways of appearance”. In the process of the primal springing – drying up development every phase of the duration at first emerges as a primal springing one and remains conscious as the same in all modifications of the drying up, keeping itself as the same in ever new ways, in ever new modes of the beenness. And thus every stretch of the respectively actualized duration is persisting within the duration which streamingly becomes conscious, that is, conscious through primal sources and drying up, that is, as living present, [persisting] as a unity of continuously ever new ways of appearance, ways of appearance that are themselves continua of the phases’ ways of appearance, as the continuous unity of which the duration shows itself.

While describing thus, purely sticking to that which the perceptual givenness of an immanent date shows us, we arrive at expected complications and manifoldness of the kind and of the sense of the streamingly living changing-oneself.

No.20

Hyletic primal streaming and temporalization

<a) The change into something new as a primal fusion of a primal impression and of retentional change>

The[[76]](#footnote-76) hyletic primal streaming[[77]](#footnote-77), the primal impressional in its continuity of change, that is, of the change, according to which the mode primal impressionality remains continuously, or of the change, in which 1) the primal impressional changes into [81] some new impressional, but in such a way that the old “evades”; 2) the “evading” is change of the primal impressionality into retentionality, while a total coincidence takes place within the content.[[78]](#footnote-78) As to the first changing, the changing of primal impression into primal impression, this is also a coincidence. The impressional is a field, a unit of fusion of the impressional simultaneity and has its identically remaining form, a word, implying something double: the specific form of the field for one hyletic field respectively, and the qualitative community of essence, for instance, of the visual genre, necessarily being kept. But is not the primal mode impression as such a moment of community, of fusion, enabling a coincidence, thus creates a unity of the coexistence between heterogeneous fields like the visual and the tactile? Thus we had some persisting general thing (form) of the impressionality and for every field the form of the field and that, which simply is the content of the form, the qualitative. A field can be impressionally “black”, “calm”, “empty”, but in truth it is necessarily qualified and concretely there, simply in a special fullness, and without any inner distinctions.

Fields do not have any actual distinction from each other. Distinction, separation, distance, contrast has its option only within a field.

Both primal changes are united within the continuity of the change, inseparable. The change towards the retention results in a Just-now being simultaneous with the new impression. But the constant change also concerns this Just-now (or rather, the retention changes into retention of the retention, and so on continuously). In every moment of the primal change we have a total simultaneity of the moment, thus a streamingly being simultaneity of a primal impression (or rather, of some primal impressional thing with its primal impressional simultaneity, of that which is now hyletically being in the primal modal sense) as a marginal phase of a simultaneous continuum of retentionalities (or rather, retentional Just-nows, graduating themselves in their mediate intentionality).

I will now try to understand the specifically temporalizing, the retained change, as something like a covering while “shining through”, a covering, which in its mediacy is a mediacy of the shining through and therein has a graduality of the ongoing “darkening”. Covering thus is something <like> overlapping and being overlapped, the temporalized respective simultaneous continuum of the Now-at-the-same-time of the modes of the Just-now (of the [82] primal impressional Nows of present) thus would be the simultaneous above one another, with regard to these modes united, fused.[[79]](#footnote-79)

But in the primal change, in the continuous streaming the fusion of the simultaneous fields, retentionally going over into one another, that is, in a covering way, takes place. The primal impressional present goes over into its Just-now, this into its Just-now, and so on. (The oblique streaming of the figure, making parallel oblique all “points” of the momentary simultaneity.)

This is the streaming of the “vanishing”, in which the primal impressional momentary present continuously changes into past and thus sinks furthermore. This takes place in a total coincidence of the temporal “content”.

On the other hand, primal impression goes over into new primal impression in the streaming, and it is this transition, which, modified as a retention and continuously retentionalising itself, makes the movement, given in the constant simultaneous field as an unchange or a change, originally in the continuity of the transition in ever new primal impression, under constant keeping of every momentary transition in the way of the temporalization, keeping the transition and its “result”, pushes it back continuously, while something new pushes itself on its place, which itself though already has the mode of the having been pushed away (as that, which has been done). The “result”, this means, change into something different, new, is only possible as a fusion of content. This is to be understood in such a way: The transition from primal impression into primal impression in truth says, that the new one unifies itself simultaneously with the immediate retentional change of the former one, and that this simultaneous unifying itself now changes again retentionally, etc. But this simultaneous unifying is only possible as a fusion of content; thus a primal fusion of the content takes place between impression and the immediate primal retention in the simultaneity of both, and this goes on in continuity for every moment and within it as an immediate fusion of the content. The fusion and its result changes soon and in every moment into something retentional and [it] remains in this mode fusion. But by this going on in such a way, and in that as a process [it] produces and has already produced a simultaneity enlarging itself, we have the unitary process of the fusion, which, as a fusion of content concerns this whole simultaneity.

“Its” momentary past belongs to each primal impressional present (as momentary, now present one), i.e. the continuum of the now past being simultaneous with it. [83] For every hyletic field taken for itself this is not only a continuum according to the retentional form, but a concrete [continuum], a continuum of the content. A unity of fusion combines in a constant mediation the momentary primal impressional and the retentional and continuous differently stepped changes of the former impressions. This momentary simultaneous fusion though is constantly streaming and within the streaming it is continuously changing by way of “pushing back” (retention) and through a continuously new impression changing in content, but also leading over a continuously fused simultaneous unity through fusion into a fused simultaneous unity, a leading over, which is itself a fusing together. Of course it takes place in the simultaneity of a higher step, binding all simultaneity with that, which has just been, just that here the respective momentary simultaneity carries within itself that, which has just been.

<b)> Constitution of concrete unities of duration within concrete impressions. Present as a concrete present

But now we need to differ the total unifying and the special fusions of the content, constituting concrete unities of duration, as persisting unities, persisting change, or rather, unchange, persisting in their duration with beginnings and endings and the lasting, <the> remaining-changingly-or-unchanged-through-the-duration.

Within the momentary impressional field we now have unities combining themselves and standing out through special simultaneous fusions, which continuously “build up”, constitute in the streaming, between streaming and streaming away, concretely lasting impressional (perceptual) unities during the duration. And the constitution of a unity means the constitution of an impressional present persisting in the streaming. A concept of present is that of a momentary impression, <that is> a mere abstraction. Another concept of the present is the concrete one, related to constituted concrete objects, the concrete present of which is that of a lasting, a duration, forming and distinguishing itself in the streaming, a continuous perceiving, having-impressional, in which the perceived is not the mere present moment, but the persisting (lasting identically) through its duration, being originally impressional as continuously being in the continuity of its development. Concrete present (actual present in contrast to present past), concrete perception (concrete impression – by which in contrast to perception [84] it is hinted at no activity being in the play), something lastingly being present, beginning (eventually ending and thereby no more being), persisting in an unchanged or changed way – all this belongs together. In contrast to that we have a concrete past, i.e. a past concrete present, past, finished lasting, not only with a past beginning, but also with an end, a being-no-more within the development, that is, a current lasting, but a past being as a past beginning, lasting on and eventually having become and now as having become ever further “sinking back”.[[80]](#footnote-80)

In the way that simultaneous primal fusions of that kind spring in the primal impressional present, let appear unities and multiplicities in one go, and in the way the ever newly appearing ones streamingly fuse, the constitution of concrete lasting unities is based, which are lasting impressions (noetic-noematic), so that “impression” has no momentary sense any more: The concretum, constituting itself originally in impression, is some developing being within the primal streaming. A being in the primal sense is a being in a primal concrete presentiation, being-in-primal-concrete-impression, being-actual-now, - in contrast to a being <as> a primal present having-been. A being, being present now (within the primal development), is an (actual) duration, and a duration is a persisting in unchange and change, which only now makes sense.

The temporalization of the concrete present as an impressional present of persisting unities and multiplicities within the hyletic sphere is the first and most primal temporalization of the time modality present, and thereafter of the time modality past. Time and time modality are forms for “objects”, for concretely being ones, being within “modalities of being”, but this means now, in time modalities, in the primal modality of the proper actuality of the being, that is, of the special lasting (in our hyletic sphere impressional) present and of the beenness, or rather, futureness, of which we are not speaking at first.

There is neither talking of modalities of being in the other sense of modalities of certainty here yet, nor of the way the beenness, the having-passed by arrives at being addressed negatively as a non-being, that is, a no-more-being.

[85]

<c) The objective, worldly time modalities>

If the world is constituted, then it is on a higher step a world of persisting objects, originally being ones as lasting presently, lasting ones. Here as well present as a time modality is related to the streaming lasting, in such a way, that is, in every moment, that in every phase of the primal temporalization a multiplicity of unities has its momentary sense, which though is a moment of a concretely lasting, persisting being in unchange and change. Soon it shows itself that we are led back here as well to the primal temporalization of the transcendental subjectivity and within it to my egologically reduced temporalization and just from there to the intersubjective one. I come from there now for me and <for> “everyone” to the constitution of the mundane time modality present through “impression”, through “perception”. But here we arrive at the mundane objects constituting themselves as “transcendent” ones, at our having constituted a mundane present through perception, through which an object’s sphere is impressionally present, a primal modal being-present (and in this sense “actually being present” to me), in relation to what a “co-present”, an intentionally modified one, is constituted; that is, the object has within itself its own present and co-present impressional of it (thus a co-present in its own essence), and above that the co-present being external to it, together with the whole field of perception (impressional field), [the co-present] encompassing the wholeness of the objects respectively <belonging to> the impressional <sphere>.

Accordingly the time modality has a world past, relation to the retentional (and recollecting) past; but the subjective past has its co-past.

As these objective worldly time modalities constitute themselves subjectively (and through the mundane time itself) and which role thereby the hyletic primal sphere and its concrete temporalization play, that of course is the huge issue of the world temporalization. Also within the world we of course have constituted an origin and an ending of objects – here through a fragmentation and connection; question of the primal objects, the “simple”, unseparated ones; this already is within the hyletic sphere.

<d)> Notes. The order of the inquiry back

On the already temporalized world as a world of experience, in its experiential sense; world in time modalities, a world present in the primal mode present [86], as a world of the primal presentiating perception, in streaming perception, „subjectively“ lasting, lastingly being concrete world present; distinguished therein something properly perceived and “co”- perceived, accepted as a co-present, inner and outer co-present, etc., inquiry back from that which is accepted, as the world, put into the phenomenon, to the subjective and the different steps of the subjective.

In inquiring back we arrive at the hyletic sphere as the last being non-egoical. But of course before that inquiry back from the full world phenomenon and its ont<ic> explanation to the passive core of the world, to the “mere” nature. The man, a psychic being within the world – disregarding all the psychic subjects; the nature remains, proceeding passively, i.e., since all activity is psychic, this is abstracted away; it is not true that there were no activity in the world, and that of course happening was already guided by activity, but pure direction of the view on the *res extensa*, etc.: related thereupon the question of constitution, which, more concrete, then becomes a constitution of the animated nature, the cultivated nature, the worldly personal communities, the development, the history of the respectively having become a being, etc. Of the “mere nature” we arrive at the hyletic and at the transcendentally streaming present in the respective abstraction, in contrast to the concrete hyletic. Affectivity and the affectivity of the Ego, etc.

May I not come back to the streamingly-transcendental present before the abstraction? I as having a world – world as a phenomenon, I in the streaming Now, etc. But does one arrive there, in this generality and without any explanation, at a useful beginning?[[81]](#footnote-81)

If someone has, limited on nature, come back to the “subjective”, then the first is the differentiation of the hyletic fields, in which nature “presents” itself, “shades”. Here now we need to differ: The respective field is a “world” of persisting data. What does the unity of a date and the multiplicity of data make, and what does unity of the field make, <what the> “persisting” of a date, streaming presentiation, the streaming, the temporalization, through which the unity can constitute itself as a concrete unity? The first is the pregivenness of the concrete unities and multiplicities; the second the ideal deleting of these concretions, ideal construction of the sense field without any objects. Furthermore, it is a new issue how multiple sense fields shall arrive at a unified temporalization with their objects and in the border case without any object.

[87]

<e)> The shining through[[82]](#footnote-82)

But now back to the “covering” as a date of retentionality. The covered “shines through”, and the shining through is something covering itself and having its shining through, etc. Are these not mere words, or rather, words being pictorial, gaining themselves their original sense only through the lesson of intentionality? The good point of the picture lies in its also symbolizing the side of the “covering”, the becoming-undifferentiated, the eventually becoming-completely-unintuitive, shining-through, becoming-suspected-through. But does it also symbolize the phenomena of awakening? The completely darkened, that which actually no longer shines through, would be nothing in a phenomenon. What does this mean though? But here we have a time field, an ever ongoing formation of a past being simultaneous within the Now, and within this field now there is a distant association, a pairing, configuration at work – in the “unconscious”, or rather, from the “conscious” into the unconscious.

Regarded from the unifying association, how does a concrete present limit itself, the impressional primal present of which is the source for the power of unity, but also of affection? Primal instituting of the fusion as a formation of unity in the standing primal Now; In the streaming propagation of the fusion, or rather, union through the retentional continuity streaming from the streaming, together with the impressional marginal phase.[[83]](#footnote-83) In the streaming ever “new” marginal phase and ever new counter-marginal phase of the most extreme Just-now, having streamed from the streaming primal phase in its continuously similar being a content. Continuously becoming covering, living fusion, a having become a covering as a simultaneous one and the simultaneity in the whole as simultaneously being one independently within the living fusion of the continuous change of the whole.

In this primal process a concrete temporal unit grows, a present date. But now we have also in the original and again in the simultaneity acquired through temporalization a pairing, formation of a multiplicity, configuration: the units, each closed in itself. In which way do they form a complete unit, that of a field and those of the fields within the togetherness, simply the unit of an initially impressional co-existence?

Within a field we have the immediacy of the fusion, continuously within the phases of a unit, but also “immediate” fusion of two units “being adjacent to each other”. The “immediacy” [88] here is the immediately-standing-out-from-each-other, continuity of the adjoining, and thus of a special fusion, and still not that continuity of the inner unifying fusion making within itself simply an unseparated unity (which thus as a primal unity does not know any separations). This immediacy corresponds to the mediacy, that of the separation through something mediating, whereby the total indeed is something respectively adjoining together with the separated one and the other. Here we have a juxtaposition of multiple things, of something continuously bound within the juxtaposition and separated within the mediacy.

But the separated then has its special fusions, its pairings, groupings. Adjoining things can pair, namely due to their similarity, but there are some distinguished pairings, degrees of the pairing, corresponding to the degree of similarity. Of course this degree has an affective meaning.

I was of the belief now that all this was related to one sense filed respectively, field from universal hyletic fusion of similarity. But now the change of temporalization itself, as a special similarity, has the force to cause a fusion, i.e. by producing the temporal co-existence of the sense fields and their unities. Of course it also plays its part in the temporalization of a sense field, but only as a moment there.
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