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<Horizons of past and future. Sleep and awakening. The unimaginability of the transcendental Ego’s death>

<a) Approximative memory of the past in contrast to the openly-undecided, pictorializing, only quasi-fulfilling envisioning of drafts for the future>

The[[1]](#footnote-1) universal[[2]](#footnote-2) self-investigation, eventually as science, as phenomenology. We and our surrounding world, we as transcendental subjectivity and as constituting a world, in which we find ourselves in a humanly objectivating way, [in which we] live into the world as persons and practice self-preservation. The private self-preservation within the common world-living; the personal communities as unities of a higher order and the sense of their self-preservation.

(Clarification of the idea self-preservation and of its steps.) Self-preservation in the already pre-given world. The awake life as a striving life; the awake Ego-subjects already constituted for themselves as world-subjects; the experiencing, perceiving etc, striving merely in the service. (The human purposes, the mature men, the organization of the “interests”, of the mature man’s purposes.)

The mature man has his “future before him”, the objectivation of the future life’s entirety, of the henceforth being as a person in the direction of his [90] “life-purpose”, organizing the manifoldness of single purposes. But does every man have a “life-purpose”? Every man has explicitly developed the objectivation of his universal future (even if he has no unitary life purpose before him). In which way? Is this a determined, an unambiguous firm preview of the surrounding world being for him in future, and of the factuality of his future behavior towards it in doing and experiencing? Of course not. The future as such, being for me, that of my external world in its way, as it is for me in the orientation giving access (close and distant, right and left, etc.) is, for every future present, is not thus constructible in the living present, as my past surrounding world and my past life, behavior, is being within it once and for all; as that on which I can ever again investigate sense in the present, which I can ever again recognize and determine as the same.[[3]](#footnote-3) The total memory of my past and of any single stretches and processes can be undetermined and according to its being-thus dubious or merely presumable, I can vacillate between multiple possibilities, how it has been, but I can investigate my past in a clarifying way, I can always accomplish my recollections, and at last find out, what “has actually been”. The coming closer to that, which already is in itself, is in advance (that it is this indeed underlies no doubt, no matter how doubtful I may otherwise be) subject to my freedom, my ability (I can), which certainly often enough is inhibited. Thus the course from givennesses of memory in the mode of lesser clarity and fullness of the content to those in the mode of the bigger ones. The limit is (although an ideal one) the perfectly clear memory as an original self-giving of the past as such, and appertinently the evidence of the repeating identification with that: I can always identify “itself as it were” in the mode.

In contrast to this is that which will be in a quite different relation to my I-can of the streaming present.

It needs to be remarked here how my past as a realm of my recollection indeed represents a past world to me, but not a past objective world as such, but a past world the way it was given to me consciously, the way it seemed to me, oriented around my thus and thus appearing body adjusted to close and distant, to right [91] and left, as a delimited perceptional field with an undiscovered horizon of the momentarily unperceived, but perceptible distance, etc. I have of the objective world respectively not only this external perception with its horizon in a time-point, but other ways of consciousness, intuition of now unperceived and still now being things, men, etc. or unintuitive objectivations of them, etc. Then of course these corresponding objectivations belong to my sphere of memory, that is, not the objective co-present as such, but that, which is objectivated by me, posited as objectively being, accepted by me as such with this and that sense.

Likewise with regard to the anticipation, pre-expectation, the pre-cast, the project of my future, like I have or may have it in the respective living present. My future contains my future surrounding world the way it is appearing to me, meant, accepted by me, constantly offering itself to me with this or that characteristic, now in such a way that it legitimates itself in the further future course, in the transition into legitimizing experience as actually being, now in such a way that it dissolves into illusion, etc. To my life belongs its, the past, appearing to me, accepted by me as being, then furthermore “a time” accepted as confirmed, but then cancelled as an illusion. Now, future is pre-cast of the past, thus something similar holds true there.

How about my future’s determinacy and the certainty of its being, the way I find it in my streaming present and possibly by free action make it evident to me as a future being? I have my current ability in the present. I have and use my ability in it to bring out my past, to make it, as it was mine, evident to me in a self-giving way. The beenness actually turns out to be a subjective being, identified within the ever-again. *A priori* there is past as a sphere of actual being. There is a decision in the form of a certain being for every presumption, for every doubt, namely the past, which has actually been; an actual being corresponds to every illusion. The actual being is an apriori norm, an idea, which I can approach in freely doing, which I can miss at times, but with the apodictic certainty that it still is as a limes, that it has its empty, freely to be produced univocal and ever more perfectly approaching ways of givenness.

But how about the future now? My future. Its intuitional manner of givenness in the present is “pre-memory”, pre-figuration. This can be completely clear, can be clearly formed. But does it give [92] a future being as a future actuality, as a certainty from self-giving evidence, which allows to cognize the being total as the one and same and single one ever again?

The[[4]](#footnote-4) future, as it is accessible for me in every present through my ability to anticipate, <is> not a field of an original experience, of a self-giving of something future as of an actuality being attainable for me, or rather, ideally attainable now in the respective present.[[5]](#footnote-5)

This is an essential situation. The future can be conscious to me in a certainty of believing, but this certainty is still a fundamentally essentially different one than that for that which has passed by. We already said, in modes of the indeterminacy, unclarity, doubtfulness, nullity, a mere possibility within an open range of equal counter-possibilities, recollection can emerge; but all that has a different meaning and [and plays a different] role for it than for the anticipation. It is simply a pre-figuration by its essential nature. It designs a “picture” the way it may come, the way it can be expected, according to the primal figuration lying in present and past. It only designs “possibilities” and still leaves open other possibilities. It can paint every possibility but essentially it does not transcend a picturing. Also a recollection can be indeterminate and uncertain, I can paint possibilities there for me as well, and apart from that other possibilities according to the frame of the still unclear recollection. But necessarily there is a decision, a fulfilling of the memorial intention through becoming intuitive of the memory, in which the remembered is that, which is actually past, the it-itself; whereas the picturings, the figurating objectivations are not fulfilling but quasi-fulfilling, simply figurating ones.

Their intuitive object does not present itself as that which has passed by itself, but as a starting how it possibly could be or could look like, as a stopgap, but not as a prototype, as self-presentiated past in its actuality. While I can use the ability of fulfilling the memorial intention, can work in a striving and wishing way towards the It-itself, thus <can> approach and eventually reach it, I have with regard to the future only the ability of picturalization, but not [93] that of an intention to be actualized in an It-itself – as long as it concerns the distant future and not the immediate one, the just now coming. Looking more closely we most correctly say:

<b) Horizons of past and future in the living present: Perpetuation of the retention towards future>

Let us consider[[6]](#footnote-6) the living present; a core content of simple (intentionally-immediate) hyletic perceptional present is within it. It is a streaming present and “runs” tendentiously as a steady fulfilling, it is a constant tendency to the continuously coming next, which continuously soon occurs, simply as a fulfilling.

The streaming is a primal phenomenon, it is not an explicit succession. A phenomenon of enhancement also belongs to the primal phenomenon of streaming (a phenomenon of increasing “magnitude”, gradations), namely the lasting shorter or longer or the lasting (“duration”) ever longer within the duration.

The concretely streaming perceptional present (core present)[[7]](#footnote-7) begins with the awakening in every awake period, and the increasing of the lasting continues up to a maximum – like a completed day, thus up to the sleeping. This duration of lasting of the primal phenomenon can co-determine the feeling: “It is lasting insufferably long.”

Let us now consider the counterside. The perceptional present is not only streamingly-streaming on, i.e. forwardly directed towards future, in itself thus the most original future, thus lying within the living present itself, in a carrying way; it is indeed streaming away on the other side, not a protentional but a retentional modification of this directedness. That is, there the talking of direction has no longer the tendentious sense or [it has] such a one only secondarily. Tendency is tendency towards something, the present implies the towards-the-future (of course this does not mean a tending, not a volitional Ego’s-striving); the “Just-now” implies a Just-now-beenness-towards-the-future, as a modification.

[94] Perhaps it is correct to say that the hyletic present most originally affects, that it is the first-affecting and that the affective draw goes towards the direction of fulfilling. That which is the second as such then is the affection from the horizons. Also the future’s horizon then has the affective preference to the memorial horizon. Then we thus had within the tendentious the differentiation between protentional streaming in primal phenomenal fulfilling and constantly protentional intention, predelineating the steadily protentional horizon. On the other hand, the retentional streaming away as a fading and thereby steadily modifying change of the respectively fulfilling Now-point. Also streaming away of the protentional pre-intending and of the fulfilling itself in the form Now. And the streaming away, the fading away, itself streams away steadily, it fades away itself, without an end, continuously losing fullness and outstandingness up to the completely empty undifferentiation; this does not mean, that this zero is a zero as such, converting into the Nothing.

The Ego now can, this is its original ability, point its regards in a forward or a backward direction, through the primal phenomenal present of perception, core present, into the future, the way it precedes primal phenomenally as a horizon in implicit intentionality and likewise into the retentional horizon. This primal phenomenal two-sided horizon is called horizon here in relation to the core, the streaming core present (simple present of perception, primal impressional). But both horizons are filled in another sense, namely with a secondary intentionality, the continuity of the Just-now consciousness belonging to the Now (to every point of the Now and to the concretely streaming primal impressional), which is itself a streaming co-present and likewise for the whole continuity of the protention.

Therefore we do have the dark un-living distant horizons, that of the re-awakenable memorial past and of the future to be pre-picturalized. Both horizons show their existence by way of the possibility to ask into, through possible affection and explicit re-awakening, recollection, etc.

If we take the complete present[[8]](#footnote-8), that is, not only the primal impressional one, but also that, which is inseparable from its core, the described horizons, then we need to say in a similar way: The present goes over into present in a streaming way, by streaming along it anticipates its protention and goes over into the new one through steady fulfilling. This relates now to the complete style of the structure; but here “retentionally” the complete present sinks down, this complete one, into a [95] “dark” Just-now, and that which is coming is dark here as well. Or do we need to differentiate between different layers of “darkness”, since the streaming is a living?

Furthermore it needs to be mentioned: the core structure of the living perceptional present constitutes corresponding to its peculiarity a core structure in the retention, a fresh past constituting itself in the streaming (e.g. the unitary melody, which is a constituted unity in the retentional change). A successive whole possibly grows then, called present in the enlarged sense[[9]](#footnote-9), the presently sounding melody. This “fresh past” anticipates its structure as future. According to the constituted past the future is predelineated horizonlike, and it is predelineated by the change of the retentional manner of consciousness emerging into the protentional as a constituting manner of consciousness. Associative primal regularity, - that is a passive predelineation of the future as something passively to be expected. According to expectation, that means: In the actively directing-oneself towards this passive pre-givenness and pre-doxa the Ego needs to wait for the predelineated to occur itself through actualization, through fulfilling presentiation; all that predelineated as a future, as distant, proper future, can only fulfill itself by coming to its primal original self as a living present in the living present, the only place of actualization as such.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Within the anticipation, as long as it keeps this mode, there is no fulfilling, whereas the recollection has its fulfilling in its mode, namely for the being past. The past is being; it is what it is, as the being of its temporal place, the place of the identically constituted past time, namely as time of my subjective “immanent” past. The future time of my existence is an improper time, my future existence, that, which I mean in advance in the respective present and make clear to me in the anticipation, is an improper being. Futureness stands not equally to the beenness, the “I will be” not equally to the “I was”, the “I will live” not to the “I have lived”.[[11]](#footnote-11)

[96] The last point is once and for all decided (“in itself”, as an idea), and it is, while I am presently living in a primal way, ever again demonstrable through memory, that is, in primal self-giving. But while I am, in primal present, originally only the most immediate future shows itself, simply through self-giving, no other than that, <which> lies in the present itself, and within the streaming on that, <which> actualizes itself continuously in it. The wide and distant future though, being predelineated from my past or otherwise inductively, is, as long as it is simply a predelineation, as long as it is merely given in an anticipating way, a presumption. I do not know for certain, whether I will live; if I mentally live it and have lived that I am living, only than can I have a doubtless certainty or an actual experiential certainty. Actual experience of the future, self-giving, does not exist beyond the immediate of the presentiation (whereby the future stops being future).

<c) Tiredness, sleep and getting awakened of the Ego of my acquisitions and my practical purposes. The death of the transcendental subject is not constitutable>

Only that is absolutely certain in an apodictic way, that a future horizon belongs to every (awake) life present, a pre-belief and a predelineation of future. It is evident that the concrete stopping, natural ending of the livingly streaming present is not conceivable as a fact, not as a being, as something experienceable. This would mean that I could realize this ending and ever again identify it as an ending, thus exactly not, that the ending had stopped and had a past after the ending, etc.: All nonsense! But is this not paradox: being in a living way in streaming present I have to believe unstoppably that I will live, even if I know that my death is at hand.

Does the necessity of the pre-belief say something different, as that an ending as such is “inconceivable”? Is this not the same as “unimaginable”? Imagination is a possible experience. What can this mean then: I do not know priorily whether I will live than until I actually do live? Do I not know that it is inconceivable that I will not live? And “I live”, does this not mean: I live as a man, I live into the pre-given experiential world? How is it transcendental? It is conceivable for every special life with special distinguished futurenesses that it will not come up. Within the apriori, transcendentally predelineated form of the future as a [97] present being presumed as necessary, and of a past springing from there then something else comes up as something else, with which the now de facto presumed is arguing. The invariable essential form of my transcendental life of consciousness in its generality as a temporal life (immanent time form) even leaves open the possibility that world experience changes itself completely and loses the form of world experience. Only that is “inconceivable” for me that I end transcendentally.[[12]](#footnote-12) Ending as a man in the objective world, dying, while others live on bodily, that needs another explanation not belonging here. But it can already be foreseen that “dying” must be compatible with the “inconceivability”, unimaginability of a transcendental being’s ending.

Which other sense may the ending have than that of a conceivable ending of a consciousness life in the special sense – of an act life? This can only be the result of the ending of all manifoldness of experience. Here of course many things are dubious. What does the possibility of persisting in recollections and of playing with fantasies depend on? What [does] the possibility of a future striving [depend on], of a doing life directed towards goals, towards future actualization? The last point presupposes a future with manifoldness, that is, with such [a manifoldness], the change of which (in a frame of practical possibilities) lies in my ability.

Anyway[[13]](#footnote-13), first of all the ending of the future manifoldness, of the predelineation of a manifold future horizon is in a certain way conceivable, and thus as a result[[14]](#footnote-14) sleep (the deep, actless, undistinguished) and death in the special inner sense (if that may be called death), which would be nothing else than a sleep no awakening leads away from.

The core of the living present, the streaming primal impression essentially prescribes in one with the constitution of the fresh and then a more distant identical past a closer and a more distant future. This implies the source of all manifoldness. How do we arrive at the limes or rather the ending?

[98] The difference (the unexplained) of the regular and the irregular, of the regular as concretely equal (unchanged) to itself, of the unlike as continuously concretely similar to it, furthermore of the unlike as a jump, forming a distinction, belongs to the primal impression in a primal phenomenal way; and this in one with the primal phenomenal lasting, which for example as a livingly streaming primal impression results in a distinguished sound with a discrete beginning and ending, like as a stretch of that, which is equal in itself. In addition the primal phenomenal co-existence of the heterogeneous; thus the heterogeneous of the visual and the “tactual sense”.

I[[15]](#footnote-15) can now imagine in a varied way that the manifoldness constituting itself in the streaming of the primal impression, becomes ever more uniform, thus we arrive at the limes of uniformity. But not as if this necessarily belonged to the sleeping in, how hard we try to achieve a simplification, impoverishment, <in order to> facilitate the sleeping in. We can if we wish move the body, etc., and thus stay awake, thereby keep up manifoldness; memories can haunt us, etc. The sleeping in like a rabbit is conceivable. In the tiredness every doing is troublesome, not funny. (The affective power fades away.[[16]](#footnote-16) Eventually the Ego does not react any more.) Every interest wanes and dies.

This thus has two sides: the empathy of the Ego and the manifold givennesses of experience. Manifold life, predelineating life’s future, constituting life’s past, is not yet an awake life, not yet interested, striving, as that directed towards the future, the primal present and the more distant one, and through it, through the future interest towards the realm of the memorial past. Since anyway the necessary, if not sufficing, presupposition of the interest is the passive manifold life present as a core, thus the case of uniformity imaginable as limes here has significance.

The sleeping Ego[[17]](#footnote-17) - I, the center of interests – is the uninterested Ego, the “passive” one. Here the question is: Is the passive underground, that, which temporalizes itself passively, without any affection in the proper sense or does a lack of affection [99] mean the ineffectiveness of the affection? Is there always an affective tendency? Only that the Ego is “tired” of following it. And how about the decrease of the “outstandingnesses’” manifoldness, is a not protruding continuity not tendentious as well, but is the “force” of this tendency at the border to zero, or rather, close to it, like a zero of intensity? (Instead of affection I would rather say the “dates’” matter is the intensity, intrusiveness, whereas the word affection is rather taken egoically, thus equated to the “stimulus”.)[[18]](#footnote-18)

Furthermore, as addition to the possible reduction, impoverishing of the manifoldness in the passivity the following needs to be mentioned:

1. [[19]](#footnote-19)If we speak of a primal impressional core (that is, formally speaking of a material, hyle), then seemingly we arrive at the lowest layer (namely “before” the core of “external”, mundane perception, or rather, therein again the natural perception as deepest layer) at the hyle in the sense of *ideas*, as core of “perceptional data”. But these belong to different “senses”, they belong to “heterogeneous” genres.
2. There are continuity and the abovementioned primal phenomenal events in every *genos* as such. The different continua coexist in the primal impressional core, associatively they are continuously uniform and they form a continuous, many-layered, primal impressional coexistence in this way.

How about the indiscrimination in every genre, and do we not under the general (title) “indiscrimination” need to distinguish again the indiscrimination in all constituting genres of sense at the same time and those merely in single genres? An indiscriminate red streaming along for instance, but the red is within the visual, associatively uniform optical sensational field. It is spread over the field indiscriminately. The field itself has no limitation, nothing optical, from which it could distinguish itself; likewise an indiscriminate other optical quality, etc.

Are the possible interpretations of the sleep, of birth, of death thus given? Is one allowed to say that sleep is a sinking of a single transcendental subject into a lasting inactivity,[[20]](#footnote-20) whereas the [100] ongoing constituting-itself of its mental process’s lowest stream remains untouched without the taking part of the Ego, or which is the same: with a completely lame interest?

Of course the following is a special problem: The necessary hyle constitutes itself as a primal impressional content. How about the objectivation though, coming from the former awake life, the life of interest, the active one, the apperceptive secularization of the hyle? That is, in the living present, the change of the same to the mundane perception, to aspects of things, etc.?

The pure hyle is in a certain sense egoless, the “apprehension” of the same, whereby it is an appearance of something mundane, is a performance of the Ego; in the mundane apprehensions the former activities are implied “implicitly” as acquisitions: the interests.

What now if I fall asleep and have fallen asleep, which on top of that has its steps, and if the mundane surrounding world has not vanished completely, insofar as the hyle has not become completely indiscriminate: If I have fallen asleep, are there still appearances-of, aspects-of, etc. in a conscious way? It is of course at the same time a problem of the “completely unheeded” background belonging to the sphere of presence, but also that of the sedimented retentional and protentional background. In a certain way I sleep in relation to these backgrounds.

The hyletic intensity, intrusiveness wakes up the Ego, which already is a human Ego, thus has the acquisition of the world experience in its habituality. The awakening departs from the hyletic manifoldness; but the egoical acquisitions are awakened and the egoical abilities – the acquisitions of the old current interests, of the old ends, volitional goals in their synthetic context, the finished goals through acquisitions, but also the unfinished ones, ends grounded on the old acquisitions, interests related to the worldly horizon of future, which is according to its form and as a universal apperception itself a continuously effective acquisition.[[21]](#footnote-21)

The [awakening] related to the surrounding world, already the background-like awakening can be stronger or less strong, [it] can reach into larger and smaller layers and [101] depths; in a certain way it goes on endlessly into the whole, in one go, but horizonlike and within the horizon-like in steps of “actualization” – not of the intuitively discovering [actualization], but of the distinguished one, delivering formed, special affections. The vague already has in itself an objective sense, but a vague one, a sense ever more richly possibly distinguishing itself, <but> in this change still the same sense, in different modes of delineation, of the sense becoming more distinct.

The Ego is awakened, the subject of the interests, I, as who I am respectively, as <the one>, who <I> have experienced this and that in my former life, have seen this and that sensuous thing , etc., have got to know this and that objective thing, have planned this and that, formed in an acting way, this and that still hold respectively in my intent, respectively thus as Ego of my practical future (of my practical present, simply that, which is directed towards the practical, the future and can only be interested for the past in the relevance for the present, which is the present of the future. That is the specific temporalization of the Ego, that it is constituted for itself and through itself as a unitary Ego of interests, Ego of the will, and as that always constituting itself and only thus having actuality. It is now actually as it is, i.e., it “has” a practical future, its goals in possible horizons being accepted in it, and it thereby has in unity the past uniformly being accepted, still relevant for the future).[[22]](#footnote-22)

I thus “at the beginning” in the natural interpretation, at my birth, do not have any worldliness and world for me yet, not yet any future of the world, in which I could plan anything. I do not have any future, since I do not have any past – in the normal sense of a worldly-surrounding worldly proper past in its form of a determined manifoldness. Such a past is my acquisition, but also a free possession – in the ability to recollect them and to cognize them as ever again the same and provable in this identity. On the other side, my future within the ability to anticipate it as a field of my practical abilities in pre-memories, to want them, to await them, to shape them actively as coming ones, as actualizing themselves eventually in the present, succeeding, failing, etc. But according to the doctrine of the constitution we have steps before that, preceding the full constitution of a world.

The Ego that dies – in the conclusion of dying the “limit” death. The Ego here thus implies the acquisition of its whole life. Does this mean [102], the Ego only falls asleep, like in the “deep sleep”, the progress of the constitutive world experience and of the whole interest life of the worldly practice, [of] every practice, only falters? Only my performing falters.

In my experience: a man over there dying – sleeping. I wake up the sleeping one, I shake him for example bodily, I call him loudly, etc.; the body, index for psychophysical stimuli, index for a regularity of its hyletic protrusions’ bonding to the organic bodiliness in its natural objective being; that is, such a regularity that the immanently-temporal order, grouping of the hyletic data enables a mundane apperception. Translated into the transcendental: Hyletic data in manifoldness, i.e. in salience, stand under transcendental conditions for me and for every Ego already being for me, for us, who we are worldly constituted and shall be able to be thus. Bodily death of the other man excludes the option for me to experience him as a worldly being Ego, or rather, as a co-being transcendental subjectivity in my world.

May I say that for himself, who therefore still is, only the conditions of the being in this world, the same [world], which I have, are suspended? And vice versa, for me the dying could consist in these conditions being suspended. This can be understood in such a way that these conditions are only those of the enabling of the mundane apperceptions, thus stand under the title “body”, but not conditions for the being of the subjectivity itself and <the> emerging of hyletic saliences. The death for the transcendental Ego can mean: It loses “bodiliness”, it loses the consciousness of the world, it exits the world order.

But how is this conceivable – for the lasting Ego? The entering into the world order signifies that <the> Ego begins with a primal present, in which hyletic saliences emerge in such an order and with such affective forces that the game of the associatively-active constitutive genesis can begin and go on. Of course this implies similar difficulties of understanding: Can the Ego have an existence of consciousness with a hyletic primal present without any outstandingness as a primal existence, and how about the reasons for outstandingness then, the affective force, etc.?

Let us remain at the pondering of the imaginableness of the subjective existence after the ending of the world order. What can this mean? The Ego is not “in itself”, it has no plans, since it has no world in front of it, it has no memory of its former interests, or rather, its former surrounding world [103] with its plans. Were it asleep it could be awakened; then it would be immediately conscious of its body and its surrounding world;[[23]](#footnote-23) the hyletic field had corresponding saliences and co-existences, course of the data together with kinaesthetic courses, then the mundane apperception were in motion, the activity of the Ego with the awakened former, implicit activity, the I-am-here, in my surrounding world, in the realm of my I-have and I-can, of my intentions directed towards the future, of my past; my I-am implies my I-have-been, etc.

The death is not a sleep; the moment it emerges my whole worldly being, my I-am stops. I can no longer have a memory for that, which I have been, what I have mentally lived, thought, designed, planned for the future, because essentially the mundane recollection presupposes that I have my mundane present, in which I am for me in a humanly-bodily way.[[24]](#footnote-24)

All this, the life, in which I am related to the world, implies: not a mere Ego, to which a manifoldness of an egoical being is contrasted, but all, at first all having-in-a-perceiving-way already implies an egoical striving, doing, ability, etc., and in the present also under the title acquisition of past intending and reaching and of the being directed towards a closer and more distant future (anticipated analogon of the past acquisition).

If there were an awakening from death as a kind of sleep, then the awakening as the Ego at least remembering its worldly existence, but no longer finds itself within the world, means something inconceivable, or in other words: a possible awakening or remaining awake and still not-being-in-the-world is a nonsense, or death would be no “brother” of sleep, but nothing else than sleep.

What other option can there be, if it is excluded that I, who I am, I, the subject of my acquired apperceptions and of my acquired abilities, am after death? Is it conceivable that my worldly being continued with the finishing of this existence in the form of a “new birth”, as a new beginning of a constitution, in which there is a new world, and even <my> Ego constituted itself in a new world?

[104]Thus the same “monade” keeping itself also with the same “Ego’s pole”, but in such a way that this developed constitutively to different personal Ego, or that one and the same monade objectivated itself to different men and constituted new worlds by entering a connection with other monades?

But is this really conceivable? Well, then it needed to be realizable in its possibility, it needed be demonstrable as an option. For whom? For me, phantasizing myself into my living and dying, that is, in a dying of a proponed sense, and making myself clear that I could become aware and demonstrate it. Or in such a way that I tried to do this in others, what would be only a change of the first try though. But is this not in closer consideration a clear nonsense? How could I, jumping from the unity of my humanity into a new birth, whereby this whole unity is absolutely forgotten, and now becoming a new man, ever remember someone else, find an entrance towards another I-being and I-life than to that of this new man?

But do we not know from psychiatry the phenomenon of the depersonalization, of different and changing Ego in one and the same pathologic “man”? But to be heeded here: the question needed be separated whether in our world there existed the possibility that while keeping the identity of an organic human body the soul of this body ends and immediately following or after a break a quite different soul, like it usually is to be expected only in another body and not in continuity of a physiological-bodily life, begins and lasts.

Further it is quite important to differentiate: 1) a man finding himself as a man in our world (and therein consorting with us), suddenly changes his personal character and suddenly loses the personal memories of his professional life, etc., and thus becomes a quite different man of this world; 2) a man changes his life of consciousness of course in one with his habituality, his personal characteristics, etc., but in such a way that he even does not experience himself as a man of this same world any more – he still finds himself as a man, but of a completely different world. In the first case an enormous content of human continuity runs through all depersonalization – the man indeed is still the same, consciously he still has the same body, still the same surrounding world, etc. The whole stream of the world constitution in its genesis starting from primal childhood and in its endless reshaping still goes on, although [105] in a certain layer (making up the problem of depersonalization) a break emerges.

But we must not in the least lose out of sight that the basis of all considerations of options belonging to the transcendental subjectivity is the I-am in the common sense, and that the phenomenological reduction at first gives us no other transcendental subjectivity than our own, at first my own and from my living present, then that of the others being constituted for me. Thereby I am in advance the one having this experience world, with this streaming present of world experience, etc., and “we” are men in this world – from there the whole transcendental subjectivity conceivable for me is predelineated, from us and from our world – in the first place from us in the fundamental normality of the mature humanity, corresponding to which the experiential world is the normal one for us. But then the intentional changes of the normal humanity in different directions: the childishness, the animal existence in the different steps of intentional distance, the pathological anomalities and eventually the border phenomena: the embryonic childhood of the man, then in analogy of animals; the pathological limes cases.

The primal source of “intuition” for all options of a transcendental subject though always lies within myself, in the changes of my own inwardness. Possibilities through changes result as limes cases in higher level “intuition” as well.

The empathy, the appresentation of a foreign subjective being, is an analogizing apperception. I understand the other one, that is, as one of my kind. This is corrected, reduced, increased, etc. It becomes a frame of similarity, in the middle of which I stand as the correspondingly to be changed primal picture. And thus I understand the child, likewise the animal, and then I always come to the point that this leads to errors, that this does not function that way and [that] I miss it in acting.

The embryonic child cannot have any world experience in the normal sense, it cannot experience its body and itself as a human child. Likewise the animal cannot simply have the same surrounding world, and if it understands me the way I [understand] it, then we have the same world and still again not the same, like we men have it amongst us and the animals of the same species amongst them. Led by foreign experience, a cautious change of the analogy is needed in order to produce options of fulfilling. In the common life this is not needed, one does not need an actually intuitive understanding, it suffices to understand vaguely[106] and to have inductive behavioristic experience, according to which one knows which one must be aware of.[[25]](#footnote-25)

[107]

C6

No.22

Form of the method of gaining the essential form of the world in an endless-open progress of the discovering of the horizons = form of the method for an “intuition of the world” as intuition of the essence[[26]](#footnote-26)

Quite easily[[27]](#footnote-27) the pre-given world seems to vary – purely as an experiential world – aesthetically – and to go over to the viewing of the essence of a possible world as such by freely building world possibilities. But the original givenness of the world in the form of the simple perception is only a beginning; the world is given, but with an undiscovered horizon. The intuition of an essence only reaches thus far as the intuition of the exemplary possibilities. Else: The essentially universal moment I gain prior to the discovering or only with relative discovering can indeed be something actually grasped but enclosed in its generality is the horizon as well, and the variation indeed varies the horizon, but only as an empty presumption. Accordingly it is an “endless” way of the ever more complete discovering of the horizons, of producing an intuition of possibility ever farther reaching into the concretion, whereby the way must consist in keeping the intention for unity and identity of the world from option to option and to go for the universal (total) “intuitive” structures, in their kind of synthetic self-constitution; Then within the total structure the most common special structures. That which one gains is ever again something general leaving open the new specialization through inquiring the horizons that have been left undetermined.

[108] We never finish the necessities of this world; within the external necessity, that of the simple experience being undiscovered as to the horizons, types approach us, like organic beings, human child as a newborn and as an embryo, animal and animal beginnings, abnormal men and animals, plants that are or could become sufficiently known for the practice of the everyday life, but have their unexplored, mysterious depths of essence. These depths are the psychic inwardlinesses presenting themselves in vague (although in their kind verifying itself) experience. How is the psychic, a universal structure of the world, as of an essentially possible? Problem of a universal (mundane) psychology and problem of its possible method. Eidetic doctrine of my possibilities (“egologically”), eidetic cognition of the pure human soul as such as of my kind (eidetic inner psychology), that is, of the man in his normality – I myself in my normal options and in the normal at the same time, which is called a normal mature man.[[28]](#footnote-28)

No.23

Arriving at a method of the destruction, of the radical unbuilding of the pre-given world in the going back towards the streaming present and systematic unbuilding of this present. [Discovering of core structures in the immanent time and nature’s constitution>

Let us follow[[29]](#footnote-29) all these “meanings” methodically, i.e., the intentional horizons, the ways of consciousness meaning beyond the already actually self-given.

1. We take our departure from the streaming present, or rather, I depart from mine, from that, in which I find myself at the beginning of the epoché, and which, taken in full concentration, is in a certain way that, which must be posited as the first, all-encompassing, insofar as it “grasps” my past or future as well as that, which is now accepted by me, and thus [109] everything being accepted by me in some kind of the “transcendency”. At first if I am for me who I am now, and if I am for me the past Ego as well, the same that used to be formerly, then I am this from my present “meaning”, possibly me of my recollecting experience belonging to the content of my streaming present. Obviously the same holds true for the world as being experienced by me, being accepted by me as such in which sense content ever, presently being accepted.
2. I systematically reduce the concrete streaming present through some “unbuilding”. I reduce to the primal impressional immanent material-present, to the “Ego-foreign”, namely the immanent hyle (sensational sphere). In this context the following needs to be considered:

The beginning with the attitude towards the concrete streaming present signifies an attitude towards the concrete stream, my concrete being-streamingly, as a continuously perceptional one. I find something streamingly present within the streaming in a different sense, that is, something originally present, simply something indeed and only perceived, whether I am especially directed towards it or not.

I now have this or that recollections, anticipations, I understand talking, etc. These are mental processes “transcending” the streaming present, exceeding it “intentionally”. The recollection presentiates, it makes conscious something past, for example a past perceiving, something not-present. But it is itself a mental process in the streaming present, it is conscious itself as an original mental process, as originally streaming in a self-present way. And thus everything and in every sense being conscious to me as transcendent is thus conscious in a self-present mental process being streamingly perceptual, a component of the streaming present.

Initially one may proceed by progressively clarifying the essential fact that the perceptional givenness transcends in the concrete present, and how it does this.

At first we grasp posto in the universal stream of a self-given present going through, and thereby we were not clear that the mundane perception universally streaming along with its mundane present were a transcending one. We thus reduce to the streaming perceptional present. We first exclude the positing of being of the presentiating mental processes, but we keep accepted all presentiating ones. We thus have in acceptance then the recollections as presentiated mental processes, but also the mundane present field, insofar as it is something perceptionally-streamingly given. Or we begin:

[110] 1) The positing of the world is perceptional, but we differentiate: its properly perceptional, the perceptional real field, and the meant along. We find in the perception of the world the external horizon as a streaming attendant meaning belonging itself as a moment of mental process to the perceptional present, but not with regard to the worldly meant therein.

2)[[30]](#footnote-30) Then we reduce this perceptional field through exhibiting the inner horizons and at last we arrive at the conclusion that mundane perception is transcendent through and through, although in the peculiar way that presentiating in a reality it allows to differentiate something perceived in a relatively proper way and something properly not-received, for the world and for every single object anew and in a new manner and in consistent relativity. In this “unbuilding” we come back to the primal impressional present stream, which exclusively leaves in acceptance something purely perceived and implies in parenthesized form everything not purely perceived and thereby implies as something purely perceived the perceiving [consciousness] and any other consciousness, that is, as [consciousness] of something not purely perceived and possibly not perceived at all.

This primal impressional streaming present of the concrete primal presence then has the following most general structure: a) the phenomenological residuum of the properly perceiving sides of mundane realities, etc., namely the sensational hyle, the primal hyle in its own temporalization; b) the “I” with all open and hidden egoical contents, belonging there: all contents of the worldly apprehension, all contents of the worldly “reference”, of the worldly horizonlike, of the worldly presentiation, etc. In this regard further differentiations are needed.

The primal hyle in its own temporalization is the so to say ego-foreign core in the concrete present.

We then needed to say: In the streaming of the concrete primal present constantly the purely immanent time temporalizes itself as the primal time, in which the primal individual being is. We thereby accept the pure stream of mental processes, the first “transcendent” in contrast to the primal impressional, streaming present of the concrete primal present.

The hyletic field continuously goes through the immanent time, which therefore is the hyletic core (material) of the primal impressional sphere.

[111] Let us now go over to other “transcendencies”. We may now depart from the concrete immanent temporal sphere (a first universe in a first temporality), springing from the streaming of the concrete present and constantly being intentionally “implied” within it. In this streaming immanence, explicating itself in the explicit immanent time, “the” objective world evinces itself, and this means a world continuously goes through the immanent time being experienced therein, or, a continuous mundane perception belongs to the structure of the streaming present. A new core now corresponds to the primal hyletic core, a new kind of hyle: That is the natural field of perception in the streaming present and the universal nature in the mundane all-temporality (or rather in the world as fulfilled time). The sensational hyle functions as “apprehensional material” for the perception of the natural hyle, and the apprehension here is a new mode to be explored more closely, [a mode] of the function, which at the same time presentiates and representiates. The “nature” is a core, material (hyle) of the world as an experienced one – a core, taking on and having in advance already in the world consciousness “mentalizing”; but the objective nature is not simply constituted due to the unitary hyle, but only the primordial core is constituted by the help of which the sense nature constitutes itself for me in the first place.

On the step before nature: Does the constitution of the hyle in itself (temporalization of the sensational date) precede the constitution of the concrete stream of mental processes as that of a unitary field of being?[[31]](#footnote-31) This needs to be considered more closely.

Furthermore: The core of the natural temporalization so to say, i.e., the streaming natural perception (as core of every mundane perception), etc., corresponds in the core of primordial nature to the natural temporalization, that is, to the first in itself, the primordial one. In this perceptional core then the hyletic primal core is encompassed as material of apprehension – but this whole temporalization is already constituted itself, namely with regard to the primal temporalization of the sensational material and its apprehension.

Furthermore: For the temporalization of the nature in the primordiality, or rather, in my immanent sphere we again encounter and already priorily a core, namely my body is distinguished in the primordial nature and for the primordial core perception, for the perception of nature, the perception of the body. Nature shows itself as spatiotemporal nature and the space [112] in orientation around my body and its distinguished way of appearance. In the streaming primal present we always already have inadvertently a perception of body, and thus my perceiving of the body continuously goes through this whole time in the temporalization of the immanent time, synthetically identically constituting the same body all the time.

Thus it then proceeds, but certainly also in an ever more complicated way. Constitution of the objective world with the help of the constitution of others who need not be represented in the primal present by perceptions related to them, whereas in all constituted mundane things the “meaning” belongs to objectivity. But all worldly things and thus above all the others still lie in the realm of possible perception, possible experience; and for the constitution of the world as world of actual and possible objective experience my own body plays for me (and then likewise for everybody) the central, the core role, but the other bodies are then still secondary centers of the objective naturalization, - the objective nature is related to the open universe of the bodies.[[32]](#footnote-32)

No.24

<Note: Steps of the consciousness-of>

The “Ego” (“person”) as center of the intentionality, on the other side the streaming life, I which all “affection” and “action” immanently temporalizes itself in a passive way, constitutes itself in a “passive intentionality”.[[33]](#footnote-33) The “stream temporality”, in which the hyletic unities, its “apprehensions as”, the “appearances of” (e.g. of stones, of real objects as such) emerge, but also the specific Ego’s acts as constituted unities.

We thus have “consciousness of” in a different sense and on a different level of founding: 1) The most primal temporalizing consciousness, in which through the primal impressions (primal presentations), primal retentions and protentions constitute the “immanent data” (the sensational data with their emotional moments, also the driving moments, all in the way of the most inner temporal), but also the appearances-of, the Ego’s acts, [113] everything being as such temporally-inner-temporally one. 2) Acts. The proper having-something-conscious, being-directed-towards of the Ego.

The consciousness sub 1) is an improper consciousness, is no “intention”. Problem of this improperty and why it is also counted as “consciousness of”. The reflection reaching back discovering it already makes the retentionally constituted unity an intentional one.

No. 25

<Note: Form structures of the living present>

The core field of the living present in its persisting formal structure, whereas the living present is concretely within the streaming.

We have the structure: 1) Primal impressional source phase of the absolute Now, continuity of the retentional form of streaming away, continuity of the protentional form of streaming on; 2) the law of the individualizing specialization of this form. But larger exactness: The streaming corresponding to the primal order is streaming of the concrete present. In this primal continuity of the stream, continuity of succession we differentiate between the momentary present as phase of primal springing for the fading away phases of the just-now-having-been-a-concrete-present and of that which is coming. Where else though but in the respective concrete living present do I find the just now past present as such, etc.?[[34]](#footnote-34)

No.26

<Note:> Having of an object, of a visual object, of an appearance, having of a sensational content. Having of something psychic, by being oneself

Supplement:[[35]](#footnote-35)

I perceive, I have memories, I thereby posit a world. Thereto my body belongs and the external objects and in a certain way their own [114] <body>, also my “soul”. I have these and those object’s appearances, I have these and those sensations: The red, the warm, etc., stands there for me itself. Likewise I have the visual objects, I eventually have the appearance of perception, I have the consciousness: This ink jar is there for me in a bodily way, etc. I am angry, or joyful, I am sad, etc.; I do not have the anger as a givenness completely in the sense I have the thing over there in the consciousness of bodiliness. The anger does not stand in front of me like the thing stands in front of me. I say “I am angry”, not “I am physical”. I am attentive, I am thinking, I think, I sense. The “having”[[36]](#footnote-36) of the color, etc. – this belongs to the Ego. But one can also say: In anger, in marking, in thinking I can live without paying attention to it and making it an object. If I do the latter, then it is something, which I had. But the fundamental difference remains: A sensational content is quite different, if it is had <as> something in front of, as an anger or a joy or a belief, although the common exists, it is an object for the subject.[[37]](#footnote-37) The objectifying, meaning as an object, making an object is already in its simplest form a function of the spontaneity of the “thinking”. This is something going through, something general. But what about the difference of the being possessed of a sensational content, of a sound for example, and that of an anger, and of something subjective in the psychic sense (of a consciousness of any kind)?

1. *Cancelled table of contents on the cover*: TTx, 23 sheets August 1930 (before the departure to Chiavari). Sheet 14 (at 21) and 21-23 <*the mentioned sheets* *14, 21-23 and „on 23“ can be found within Ms. C 6, sheet 2, 3-5 and 6*>. General form of the method for the gain of the essential form of the pre-given world as a world of possible experience and its constitution, that is, of the transcendental, or rather, psychological form. Essence of the man and of his human surrounding world. Unbuilding in a radical way. Going back to the living present and unbuilding of this present. The „cores“ in their different steps. From 20 on especially to be heeded. Content. Therein also a structural analysis of the living present. Especially from 20 on. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Rb.:* VIII, 1930 August. Practical norms. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Rb.:* Like in the present recollection past and as in contrast to that future is given in anticipation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *Rb.:* Nota bene cf. 5 <= *here sheet 6a*> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Rb.:* The being in advance of the future memory in contrast to the being of the past in the recollection – pre-figuration, no actual self-giving. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. *Rb.:* From here on: Consideration of the living ont<ic> present as the world’s phenomenon of present for me. In the following this becomes the primal hyletic present without any further ado. But the systematic way of reduction towards the core present nature is lacking and from there on towards the primal hyle, like on the other side the distinguishing of the egoical present and thus of the sphere of primal perception as a primal stream of the passive temporalization. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *Rb.:* Does this mean hyletic <present> or <present of> nature? [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *Rb.:* Complete present. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. *Rb.:* Present in the enlarged sense. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. *Rb.:* The apodictic future predelineated as a general form, and thereby the „apodictic presumption“ „of a“ future is in principal only a place of picturalization (with the exception of that living future going to be fulfilled, to be actualized in the concrete present). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. *Rb.:* Cf. 1-3 < *= sheet 2-4, here page 89ff*.>. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. *Rb.:* The transcendental, streaming present has in apodictic necessity in every phase the invariable form: presumption of future and the form of a continuous will-be is concretely-continuously determined as a future form of its past. But within the streaming, corresponding to this correlatively persisting form, can the change of the „different“ take place in the special shape of that, which is de facto presumed as a future special event, which of course in its „emerging differently“ therefore still does not hurt the invariant universal form. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. *Rb.:* Appendix I-II <= *Ms. B I 13, 107-108*>. In the following on sleep. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. *Rb.:* As a result: The sleep itself is a sleep of the interest, of the Ego’s activity. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. *Rb.:* Sleep. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. *Rb.:* Is this completely true? The being affected is already embarassing in the tiredness, all stimuli repel, instinctively one turns away, pulls back from them. Sleeping instinct, the striving to withdraw, possibly willing to sleep. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. *Rb.:* Thus sleep is sleep of the Ego, of the center of affection and action. The Ego sleeps, it does not follow any affection, it persists in passivity. All interests remain, but without any action, they rest. The Ego is in absolute rest, the Ego of striving, the Ego of will. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. *Rb.:* Affection and stimulus: Ineffectiveness of the affection for the Ego. The Ego is closed for it. They quasi praise themselves, they have more or less affectivity in one sense, but there is the new thing on the side of the Ego that they more or less exercise a stimulus, more or less address interests, or „according to reigning interests.“ [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. *Rb.:* Core – nature – hyle. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Or rather into a lasting inaccessibility of the Ego for affective stimuli? The Ego, sensing affective stimuli (towards which urgencies could advance), is active: Battle of stimuli, battle, argument of interests; current interest, prevailing, temporal, on the other side momentarily breaking in; a stimulus breaks in in a „disturbing way.“ [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. *Rb.:* The Ego’s volitional directions – the validities, the „finished“ volitional goals are still volitional goals though; the „finished“ is avolitional mode and a momentary volitional act, it institutes a lasting volitional direction within the Ego, and it remains as a finished one as well – insofar as there does not emerge a modalization. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. *Rb.:* On this appendix 81-82 *<= Ms. B I 13, 109-110*). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. *Rb.:* It then had a body and lived in a bodily way, though sleeping. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. *Rb.:* Has this been justified? [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. *On the back cover sheet 14b the following deleted summary*: TxTx. August 1930 (appendices 16.XII.31), C4. Main content: How past and future are constituted within the living present.

    If one wishes to clarify the idea of the human personal self-preservation then the first question is, how the man has constituted the unity of his life at all in his life, in his streaming living present – therein unity of his total future and past.

    Detailed explanation of the fundamental difference: How recollection bestows one’s own past itself and how pre-memory does not bestow one’s own future itself, but only pre-picturalized: 12-3. This serves the consideration: How in the living present past and future is constituted. Concerning the structure of the living present some (but not in systematically built designs) approaches.

    This leads 52 to the question of the possible finishing of life (Life as life of interest) and to the questions of possible interpretations of sleep, death, birth. Accordingly to the question of the conceivability of a „world extinction“ through annuling the intentional world constitution. On that appendix I-II (from 16.XII.31) (*meant possibly B I 13, sheet 107-108*).

    Thereby the clarity that all world constitution is a performance of the interest, the will, the differentiation of lasting acceptance and constant making-accepted-anew is guiding. Important notions on salience, intensity, gradual affection on the Ego, concerning contingent apriori, cooncerning formation of majority and affection of the majority, concerning the relation of affections and activity, concerning the sense of lasting acquisition, concerning the modes of activity as volitional modes, among them the modes of the having-been-acquired, concerning failing and modalization, concerning truth of the Ego (self-preservation) as idea and correlatively truth of the world as an idea. Important appendices B1-B2 (*meant possibly B I 13, sheet 108-110*) have as a theme sleep and death. Elementary things. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. *The title on the envelope I/9 relates to the texts No.22-26:* From TT *<= Ms. 4*>. August 1930. First beginning of a methodical unbuilding of the primal phenomenal present, at the same time as method of the unbuilding of the pre-given world as such and of the question back to the subjective ways of appearance instead of the method of an ontology of the experiential world and of this as a transcendental guiding line. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. *Rb.:* From TT <= Ms. Ca>. August 1930. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. *The sheets following this text, paged by Husserl as „15-20“ can be foud in E I 4, 30-35 (printed as text No. 6 in Husserliana vol. XV, page 81-90).* [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. *Rb.:* From here on. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. *Rb.:* Reduction to something purely perceived. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. *Rb.:* Why preceding? In all change, all possible layerdness of the stream of mental processes necesssarily the core constitution is encompassed. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. *Rb.:* Then furthermore the personalization, the humanization in one with the world humanizing itself as common, social and cultural world, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. *Rb. :* Also mediately the abilities, the interests. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. *Rb:* Up till now there has been no speaking of the acts and of the acts’ Ego. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. *Note for the dating: According to writing and paper sheet 8 was produced before 1910*. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. *Rb.:* Having as thematically-having – having as a real content of the psychic being, be it thematically or not, whether mental process or habit. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. *Rb.:* „I feel, I become affected by the sensational content“ needs to be differentiated from the „I have the sensational content itself“. The having-as-an-object is itself egoical. Sensational data are not-egoical, are Ego-foreign; again for transcendency: Objects are Ego-foreign, foreign persons, foreign egoical mental processses are egoical. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)