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No. 27

<I become an observer of the mundane Ego in transcendental reduction. The reduction to the core sphere of the perceptual present excluding memory and future>[[1]](#footnote-1)

The transcendental reduction as reduction to my transcendental Ego in its unexplicated “silent” concretion – the first seeing of an essence and description, that of the most general constant form structure of the transcendental Ego, is that of the constant streaming.

I try the following procedure:

I have as an Ego in the philosophizing beginning through the first application of epoché : me as an I being in the world acceptance, in the world life, having accepted the human Ego among that, which apperceives itself as an acting man and the acting as an anthropological occurrence in the world by way of acting. As a transcendental observer of this Ego living in a natural attitude – of the transcendental one, I find myself as an Ego of the universal world perception; as I myself, having become thematic here, is this its world perception transcendental. At first I find this streaming world perceiving, in which is the perceived, the world, more precisely, the world being now for me, the world in its streaming standing present as perceptual present.

Differentiation of the streaming perceiving with the perceived as such, which is inseparable from it, on the other hand of the world, actually being for the transcendentally perceiving Ego, showing itself in truth. [116] Keeping pure of the transcendental-subjective: stream of the world perception – as perception of the perceptual world present “as such”.

This perceptual present certainly is now a broader one, now a closer one (the “minute”, the “hour”, etc.). If I pay attention to the streaming perceiving (the “noetic”), I notuce that on the one hand indeed I am speaking about the perception of present (e.g. I perceive that I am now doing my morning work – this of course transcendentally reduced), on the other hand that I differ in that between perception and presentiation (in the example: the working being properly perceptual now and the recollecting former studies of morning work); my streamingly perceiving of the content morning work is constantly of such a being-sense (that, which is accepted in this perceiving as a perceived being), that it holds a constant and streaming horizon of acceptance within itself, which explicates itself in recollections, recollections, which then count as well without further ado when speaking of the perceiving of this objective something. It is and remains a perceiving of the same for me, if I feel the need to get clear and distinct in my mind, “what is the perceptually meant” there, how it is explicated – through recollections and possibly anticipations, etc.

Well, instead of making the worldly perception of some perceptual present a theme in this way and already explicating it in its noetic structure, therefore again differing perceiving and remembering in it itself, I so to say take <the> perceiving in general in an unexplicated way.

I thus now proceed by pointing out that such a streaming perceiving, in which I mean a perceptual present, can combine with a memory “going beyond” this present, and thus in general with a “memory” of any type. In the streaming of transcendental life as a life of world consciousness I have in any case streaming world perception with world present, on top of that [I also have] world memories, thereby consciousness of world past and world future.

Now the question on streaming transcendental world perception with its world present could be introduced and the relativity of past, present and future be shown and the elimination of the remembering presentiations be carried out. It can already be shown thereby that world present has always a consciousness horizon of world past and future, as a horizon of possible [117] recollections and anticipations, like the horizon of co-memories with regard to spatial present.

Now reduction to the “pure perceptual present” – “exclusion” of the co-functioning of memories – as a core of the experiential consciousness of the world. Thus abstraction at the world as transcendental *cogitatum* of the transcendentally experiencing and in a certain wide sense perceiving *cogito* of the world, - while in this abstraction the memorial past, the memorial co-present, the memorial future remain unaccepted, and the world remains in the streaming pure perception, as a pure streaming world present, that is, from this pure perception.

The essential structure of the standing or constant streaming, of the transcendental Ego’s persisting form can now initially be explored in this core-sphere as a stream of mental processes or a consciousness stream without paying any detailed attention to the description of the consciousness as such. The primal self-temporalization of the transcendental Ego is thus demonstrated here and it is only later shown that that, which has been eliminated as a memory, also belongs into this streaming, or that a concrete Ego is a primal concrete streaming with a core of constant world perception, that is, pure perception.

We have primal present, primal past, primal future in this primal temporalization as constituted modalities, temporal themselves, streaming for their part and constituting the identical time within streaming. Past is here a retentional past and not a past of recollection – it needs to be shown first, how one adheres to the other, or rather, how the memorial modalities are only time modalities by their being related back in a certain way to the retentional ones.

At bottom though the primal time is not seriously time yet, but only a preliminary step of time as a form of co-existence. In the continuous primal streaming the self-constitution of the Ego is brought about as a streamingly persisting unity. Within this form the passive and the active (specifically egoical) streaming, or rather, within that, which is constituted, within the temporal form the being passive and the passive proceeding within time and the active and in general egoical happening are distinguished as affectivity and activity.

[118]

No. 28

<The transcendency of the world is constituted within the transcendental self-temporalization of the Ego>

“Self-temporalization” as a performance of the primal streaming is a dangerous word. The streaming as such does not temporalize. Time is a form of co-existence. I can set myself towards the pure streaming as a transcendental observer, towards the constant fading away of the primal impressions. If I do not perform an original identification then: “The same, which “fades away” there, the same persisting in an unchanged way, but presenting itself in ever again other modes.” I keep on – the sound fades away, I keep it, mean it continuously, it, the same, in the change of sinking. What is it, this “sounding”, being it, coming into existence with the impression and then vanishing, but being away not as a sound, but as past sound? Is this <determined> in an appropriate way as a “hyletic date”, which is a piece of content of the stream? Certainly, I always need two things: the streaming field of the “mental processes”, in which constantly is a field of primal impression, fading away into retention, protention before it – on the other hand the Ego, being affected from there and motivated to action. But is the impressional not an apperceptive unity already, something noematic from the Ego, and does the inquiry back not always lead to <an> apperceptive unity?

What[[2]](#footnote-2) is self-temporalization actually?

If I overview and identify the primal streaming – the Ego in its originality – in an unexplicated way as the continuously streaming Ego, then I do this as a observer.

What kind of “apperception”, of giving-acceptance-to and originally identifying is this?

I have the streaming world apperception in an unexplicated way, in which the thematic Ego continuously identifies, and performs many kinds of special acts within the frame of the unitary consciousness, among them “judging” identification and other syntheses. I, the phenomenologist, observe. I swim along. I perform recollections, repetitions, identification of a new step and kind. Then: The Ego does not perform them in the theme? If one says that every recollection or repetition of that kind is one of the Ego in its worldliness, then one needs to consider that [119] the transcendental Ego recollects its transcendental consideration, that is, that a new repetition takes place. The transcendental reflection is a universal modification of naturalness.

It is still a pure perceiving though of the concretely streaming Ego and a repeating considering; that which is streaming in a concrete way is a streaming universal apperception and constituting a universal unity of acceptance, a noematic unity. I see the streaming in a reflecting way and the unity streamingly constituted therein, with everything belonging to this; I explicate the concrete Ego, reflecting in an observing way. But what characterizes recollection as such a merely reflecting repetition?

It is striking[[3]](#footnote-3) thereby that we will tend to differ without further ado: Manifold presentiations presentiate some generally manifold having-beenness of mine, in general, since different presentiations can also make objective the same “I was”. Accordingly that, which has already been touched on: The manifold presentiations can emerge as straightforward presentiations, as simple ones, but also as presentiations of a different step and of a somehow higher one, insofar as the directly presentiated can presentiate a presentiating, which itself again implies its presentiated past (or future), being co-accepted, as if it was a straightforwardly presentiated one, as it could indeed be, etc.

But all such remarks already go beyond that, which direct and first analysis explicates. Because if multiple presentiations for example are cognized in a presentiating way as the same past, then it is obviously a synthesis of identification performing this cognition, a synthesis, which itself a new mode of streaming life related to presentiations presents, that first of all like every mode needs to be demonstrated as a structural content within the streaming.

Guiding idea that indeed the primal stream of my I-am is self-temporalizing, but that only through memorial consciousness as consciousness-of, as intentionality, a proper being comes about as temporally existing. If we now take into consideration as something new that within the streaming I-am, within the primal life, making up my primordium, not only a self-temporalization of this life takes place, and the intentionality related to that, but that also the conspicuous moments of life, which we also call transcendental mental processes, show a second intentionality, namely insofar [120] as they are not only streaming, but make conscious world.[[4]](#footnote-4) Living in a primal way (within the standing streaming) I am “conscious” of me as a present, past and future I-live, I, the transcendental I. In this life I am conscious of the world – which I, the transcendental I, am not, which in my transcendental primal temporality, temporalizing itself as self-constitution in the standing streaming, does not occur, is ego-foreign to it [the transcendental primal temporality], is a transcendental non-Ego. World is temporally being, it is itself nothing else than filled time – world time, space time. Thus a second time towards transcendental time, the way the intentionality, through which world is conscious, is not the one through which I am conscious for me myself as an immanently temporal (transcendentally temporal) one. The transcendental mental processes having their transcendental-temporal being (thanks to the transcendental self-temporalization) are temporalizing for a new time, or rather, for a new being, simply that, which constitutes itself in the temporalizing intentional performance of these mental processes within transcendentality, but “transcends” them themselves.

No. 29

<Note: Awakening of horizons. Affection and action.>

The apperceptive intentionality as transcending the stream in its [the intentionality‘s] noematic unities. The stream and the temporal field of “immanence”, the field of mental process, the mental processes as worldly apperceptions, as acceptances of being in a horizon of the skill lying within one’s ability, or rather, the noematic abilities.

How are the horizons immanently temporal? The mental process as perceiving this armchair. To see the same armchair in different ways of appearance subsequently, the synthesis of identification, the continuous unitary consciousness in the continuum of the change of appearance. The meaning of the “I”, the having-in-acceptance-of-being and performing acceptance of being in continuous identification currently-actively – all that though as a mental process within the stream. All modification of the “still in acceptance” is a modification of the mental process at the same time within the one-dimensional change of stream, within the standing-constant [121] streaming a “verification”, a keeping the same merely in “coincidence” of the association’s modification. But is that identification? Or is not that, which continuously modifies itself there, any Ego-intentionality, but the Ego keeps its “direction” within the necessary modifying of the mental process, maintains its taking a position within itself. But the taking a position can be modalized.

“Connection” of the Ego and the field of mental processes. I in wakefulness in the field of my current, awake apperceptions.

The field of “mental processes”. But the standing streaming as a standing change: constant lighting up of a total impression, constant sinking, diminishing, fading away.

The impressional mental process: The Ego is primal active within it, but it has a hidden horizon of skill within the activity. As belonging to the apperception it is in function – in the awakening. <There are> modes of activity within the sunken, and ever new awakening, egoical. The Ego of the acts is an Ego of the habitual interests, and every noematic is a formation of interest. The egoical secrets of recollection – awakening of the sunken retention, awakening within the Ego, their retention – but affection, egoical “repetition” of the apperception’s presentness, re-actualizing. Recognizing, the awakened apperception as “dark”, in the mode of still-acceptance, in the transition into the form of repetition an identification of the noematically meant. The Ego in community with its past activity, currently present Ego and “re-awakened” past Ego; Being-in-community.-with-oneself, entering-a-community with oneself in its unitary temporality. The activity in the mode of giving way, of following the affection. This happening can become a voluntarily active one, I want to recollect.

But apperception has its horizon of ability. The current apperception and the possible apperception (possible experience). Affection from the side of awakened possible experience (which themselves imply their horizons of ability in the mode of possibility within themselves). The becoming-intuitional of the abilities as a possible experience and the voluntary getting-the-horizon-clear-in-one’s-mind – external perception, the perceived, the system of possible experiences in the acceptance of being awakened in an implicitly horizonlike way and therein their noematic unity as to be actualized by me in actual experiences; Getting one’s mind clear, the being actual in the being thus, the actualizing possible experiences is their ability, the actualizing-the-being-true, as itself in the production of actual experiences: “Actualizations” of possible experiences.

[122] What kind of “intentionality” is it known as “retention”? Is it intentionality at all? I have a constant intermingling of modification, that of <…>, of etc.; still the proper intention is missing.

That which is streaming there, is “consciousness-of” though, is actual intentionality, is Ego performance, implying affection and action of the Ego, active acquiring, intent, horizon of ability, etc. That which “is streaming” there is for example taken as a detail the “mental process” perception of a table. Nothing else happens within streaming, purely regarded as streaming, than primal association, in which mental processes verify a unity of simultaneity and succession. All directing oneself and being directed of the Ego presupposes “mental processes”, presupposes inner and outer, simultaneous and successive association, with the help of which the mental livings are unified within a universal simultaneous-successive field. The directing-oneself, the being-affected is itself again a mental process emerging within the stream, or rather, within the field, that is, belonging as well to the area of that, which can affect my Ego and defines my directing myself in a doing way and thus *in infinitum*.

I am I – center of egoicalness, but I am only as an I of a field of associatively combined unities, into which all egoically temporalized streams and has an associative temporality.

I am.

I as center of action and affection, I as a feeling I – am I as well being in a streaming way, temporalized in the field through streaming association? Am I simultaneously with any mental processes or else a successive, associative unity among associative unities? I am a subject of my abilities, my “ways of consciousness”, my acceptances, my intentional objects with their intentional horizon, which is a horizon of abilities. Is my Ego an intentional object with a horizon as well, etc.? But I can occupy myself with myself, etc.

Apperceptions proceeding in a passive way – the happening in a field of mental living, “processes” therein. “Persisting mental processes” – apperception persisting in an unchanged way, changing – that which is actually as a mental process thereof – as egoical, I can “involuntarily” or voluntarily engage by way of affection and action, while always the mode of the field and of its own occurrence remains in “unchange” and “change”.

[123]

No. 30

<The transcendental Ego as observer and the world appearance. Self-presentation and attendant meaning. Reduction to the self-presenting, purely perceptual>

I as a transcendental observer: The primal streaming of the awake I. Inquiry back: Performance of the I in the “field” of temporalized time.

The first of temporalization – the primal stream, “immanent” temporalization, “field of mental processes”. How does the egoical present itself on higher steps? Indeed not only as a happening in the immanent time.

There is a large uncertainty, nay, what is more, the most important is not seen there and the whole statement is in doubt, nay, wrong.

I – not-I.

I have the I and the not-I within the world phenomenon, and I have the transcendental I and the world phenomenon transcendentally – transcendental I and human I as a phenomenon and this “within the world”. As a transcendental I I have a streaming “present”, streaming along transcendental life, which is a mentally living the world, always world in acceptance. I am within the “belief”, I am by my having an opinion, certainty, modalities of certainty, this I-am-having is an “I am having a having”. I am within a life, a temporal life, which is mentally-living something: as mentally living I am I of acceptances of being in modes of acceptance.

The streaming life of consciousness, the *cogitationes* as that of the *cogitata*.[[5]](#footnote-5) But I am the “thinking” one in them, and I am the performance-I of thinking performances in the modes of performance; the I in its egoical way of being of the “thinking”.

The “immanent” time field – the awake field, not as a world field, but as an immanent field of the awake life, therein the “first” immanent present of perception, furthermore therein the presentiation of my primal present; furthermore therein the empathies as the modifications, in which respectively my immanent field with all its possible modes of presentiations and temporalizations as such becomes intuitive as an “analogon” and someone else becomes accepted by me.

Constitution of a universal primordial immanence – eventually also intersubjective immanence, - but through I-performances and they are [124] appearances-of. I have a primordial world therein, impressional world present, primordial co-present, co-past, co-future of the world.

3) I have empathy as well, the altering modification, in the immanence, in the streaming transcendental present.

1) The first is the formal most general of the streaming, the primal standing streaming, therein the streaming “temporalization” of the immanent stream. On both sides form and content (“presentation” and presented unity).

2) The question on the content, in this form of the immanent streaming’s continuity, thus is the most general structure of content now – form in the new sense, that of content. The next needs to be said: The streaming is the noetic world phenomenon, included therein the streaming partial phenomena, those of the single worldly thing. General description; in what way is it to be touched?[[6]](#footnote-6)

I, the transcendental observer, describe: the perceptual. Streamingly-standing primal present is already something perceptual – “purely” perceptual. Therein distinction though between impression and “idea”= presentiation. Likewise in a more concrete way: the purely perceptual content “world phenomenon”, purely perceptual the world appearances and their synthetic unity “world appearance” – as a mental process, in which world is conscious and appears itself. Single worldly object: the manifold appearances as appearances of the same and called “perceptions” of the worldly object. The streamingly “perceived as such” and its own synthesis.

Reduction to the purely “perceived” of the stream of mental process, which for its part is a perceiving of the world, to the pure world perception in the content of immanent perception (in the “stream of mental living”) as a stream of mental livings, which for their part are perceptions of something worldly.

The differentiation between proper perception and something perceived, properly having something itself, self-presentation of something worldly and attendant meaning. This may say: “Thoughts”, judgments, intents, determinations of purpose in respect of the perceived and in contrast to that the self-appearance as a core thereby. Also recollections of the same.

Stream of “proper perception”; then again the differentiation between proper perception of the actually appearing side and attendant meaning of other sides. Horizons of perception belong to the perception as perception of [125] the object – the unity in its self-presentation through manifold synthetically connected appearances: in contrast to the “coating” of “meanings”.

Reduction to the purely perceptual in the new sense, i.e., stratification in the perceptual of concrete immanence (of the streaming present), abstractive reduction to the content of form, in which world comes to self-appearance perceptually and in purity.

But could I not have interrelated I and stream earlier, at least after I had determined more closely the concrete stream as a stream of world experience, of the world consciousness as such?

Right at the beginning though there is the epoché and the Ego, which is subject of the world phenomenon.

Thus I do not have right at the beginning: reduction to the stream and streaming “immanence” – but soon the double sense of reduction to pure perception – double sense of streaming present: layer of the originary impressional perception (in which no presentiation functions along).

But is it not better to only describe that when going back from world perception: stratification of the immanent present, which is purely perceptually streaming, but has a sub-layer of perception within itself and a layer of presentiations.

No. 31

Primal method of phenomenology. <The interest in the universe of the subjective in the epoché>

I have modified the world consciousness and the conscious world in the epoché, simply in the mode of the containing the natural world life in all its interests. A new interest shall be employed, the interest in the universe of the subjective, in which world has its being sense for me, in which thus my human being itself gains its being sense.

I want to get to know my being and life, through which world is as this one for me and in its currency, in which it is this one for me, in the change of valuations on being and illusion, in the change between secure certainty, doubtfulness, mere option, possibility, etc., in the change of subjective perceptual appearances, subjective ways of givenness as perception, as recollection, as pre-expectation, etc.

[126] I want to return to my subjective meaning, [my] appearing, [my] being accepted by me, and so far that I apprehend the subjective in a pure seeing. I continuously perform perceptions, memories, judgments, valuations, actions as acts, as new acceptances, new meanings on the basis of old acceptances in naturalness. World is always pregiven. All perception, in which all other acceptances are rooted, are adperceived. I parenthesize all of that kind.

I want to give acceptance exclusively to something self-seen under the exclusion of all co-accepted. I begin with a pure seeing, a pure, adequate perception and I gain new primal apperceptions through it, which I acquire and have acquired as a transcendental I for me myself; I establish a new life for me – a life of continuous purely seeing, and from there further establishing itself a life in “transcendental apperception” under constant systematic formation of transcendental apperceptions.[[7]](#footnote-7)

A thorough description thus is needed of the primal method of phenomenology, of the methodical thinking from pure seeing and in the systematic of transcendental performances as formations of ever new transcendental apperceptions – the transcendental evidence – and their determination in concepts and judgments as transcendentally pure truths. The transcendentally phenomenologizing I (and afterwards the transcendental We) arrives at a new self-creation in this doing, a re-creation of the natural I towards an I of radically pure self-consciousness, in radical and final truth, and thereby to a radical and final world knowledge, all-encompassing knowledge.[[8]](#footnote-8)

[127]

No. 32

The self-temporalization of the transcendental Ego. <Epoché, reduction to the streaming present and primordial reduction: the primordium as a place of constitution of the worldly time modalities>[[9]](#footnote-9)

1. Reduction[[10]](#footnote-10) to the “absolute primordium”.

I am within the epoché – as an observer of the streaming I-am-conscious-of-the-world, within the unitary consciousness being world; I am in a streaming way conscious of it in ever new modes of consciousness, ever new modes of givenness. Reduction to this streaming, to this ways of consciousness, in which something worldly and world itself is conscious as some same and existent, being accepted, certain.

World present is conscious within the streaming – perceiving consciousness; world past is conscious – in recollections, world perception and world memory in the unity of the streaming-now, of the streaming present.

The continuous lasting of the perceiving within the streaming, e.g. [perceiving] this paper; the lasting being of the perceived paper – within the lasting, continuously now lasting perceiving of the same. This lasting perceiving, for example lasting at the same time with a recollection of a yesterday with yesterday’s duration, time, but the recollection lasting now. Perception and recollection within the streaming-now as its moments, in which it has its total duration, lasting. But this is not psychological now! The world perception universal – included in that my self-man-perception, as a streaming constant having-world-perceptually-in-acceptance – the transcendental world perception. But, the transcendental world consciousness as streamingly-lasting.

In the primordium perception of something worldly and world differs from presentiation of something worldly and world – that is, within simultaneous lasting.

Perhaps it is the first before the introduction of this differentiation, to demonstrate the being of the streaming in starting from the constant world perception as constant [128] lasting, as a lasting present. Constant world perception comprises single perception – beginning in the streaming change, lasting, disappearing; in the streaming total connection one after the other, but within the whole as within the single thing a lasting and constant present within the lasting, constantly streaming into the just-now, and constantly having a coming before it, becoming something actual now and as something actual is now something actualized of something which is just now coming.

We thus have a streaming world perception within the primordium, which is as a constant lasting of a unitary perceiving within the epoché, a lasting perceiving. As something lasting it is in the constant rigid form just-now-coming and in the likewise invariant form of the standingly constant change of the now actual perceiving <of a> moment into the just-now, of the just-now into the just-now of just-now, etc, as on the other hand of the constant change of coming and transiting into some now actual perceiving. There are special perceptions in the lasting being within this complete form, streaming, streaming away, or rather, streaming into, but beginning to last as special perceptions, and ending, and no more lasting after the ending now, but only streaming away, thereby creating a streaming succession together with the other special perceptions. The whole is still always a lasting present, and afterwards it lasts in such a way that not all special perceptions can have streamed away, rather in the unity of a perceptual now, as of that which is now actualized, [as] this and that special now of something special worldly is actualized simultaneously. The now includes a now-at-the-same-time – likewise every just-now of the whole perception [includes] its just-now-at-the-same-time, etc.

Although we, as will be seen soon, have thereby analyzed only one layer of the primordium, certainly in a rough way, we can already make apparent something important. The “primordial” Ego as primal being within the lasting-on has a double being-actually-now, and therein a double special being in simultaneity.

1. The momentary total perception is actual now, and within this [total perception] those special perceptions belonging to this momentary-now (perceptions of course as moments of this primordium, that is, not its perceived worldly) are simultaneously actual now.
2. The total perception as a momentarily now actual perception is a phase in the primal stream. A single perceiving, which has just now ended and is streaming away continuously, remains conscious as streaming away. Thus also the consciousness of the perception, which has just now streamed away into the just-now, is still actual now and is a simultaneous actuality in one with every now actual [129] perception, although the perception that “has passed by” is not actual now.

We thus do not only have the unity of the momentary actual perception in the primordium, but in unity with it the retentional consciousness, that of the just-now, and the protentional one, the one coming from the just-now. But the just-now is not one, but a whole continuum of a constant form, persisting invariantly within the streaming change, as the simultaneous continuum of the complete form in general, in which <the> Now as a phase of transition of both continua of the just-now and of the coming becomes conscious. The primordium is a stream, a standing streaming, streaming in a constant invariant form, but this in a wondrous way, so that a double present constitutes itself within streaming: the present of the respective worldly perceiving and the present of this perceiving in simultaneity with the retentions and protentions of the perceptions, which have just-now streamed away or are just-now streaming hereto. The one and the other present is a continuously lasting present, within the lasting a constant present of a constant continuum of just-now beennesses: that is, a multi-dimensional continuum of persisting form within the streaming, a multi-dimensional present, which is simultaneously filled in all phases and consists of a vivacity of this totality’s intentional modification within streaming.

The “primordial” being, as a being within constant streaming, is characterized as a being in the ever new modifying-itself, which is at once a modifying-itself in every linear, in every punctual phase and a constant having-been-sprung-from-modification.

I am persisting multi-dimensional present within the streaming as a “primordium”; my primordial vividly streaming past is continuously “presentiated” within this present, and likewise my primordial future. I am perceiving world therein in the primal modal Now, but at the same time I am having perceived world in constant simultaneous modification; thus I am constantly perceiving world and having continuously perceived, having had perceived, etc.

Taken as a phase in every present, and thus in a standing, continuous present, I am in such a way that I transcend my present being. I am actual and concrete as constant present; that is my concrete being. But it is a concrete streaming, it implies the continuity of the intentional modification of the momentary primal mode Now as that. I have again a simultaneity myself within the primal mode, that, which is now actual, is as a primordium in the momentary unmodified actuality, which [130] is continuously modified within streaming. The momentary unmodified actuality, the total of my momentary being-now-actually, again contains a primal mode. It is world perception, <which> presentiates the world momentarily in a primal way. This <primal mode> is the limit of simultaneity of intentional changes; the change as consciousness is actual now, but in its changed intentionality it makes conscious the proper Not-Now; the Not-Now goes beyond the Now, especially the consciousness of the Not-Now. Thus the continuity of the intentional changes is a constant continuity, in which transcendence becomes conscious in a primal way, and this transcendent is always consciousness; always I myself as a primordium, not as the one I am, but the one I have been. In the whole continuity I am momentary and relatively concrete present, present primal actual primordium, in a way primal constituting something primal past in itself and something future; and thus I am as a primal modal present in community with me as concretely being in my temporality in a continuous having-beenness and futureness, I carry my temporal being in my present. This present as a lasting one is a constant being-streaming, [is] always streamingly a being-present, which has constituted and always constitutes in a streaming way temporal being as a present past and future, in such a way that present becomes a new present, that present streams over into the just-now, this into the just-now of the just-now, etc. I am within the streamingly creating a transcendence, a self-transcendence, a being as self-past and self-future and of self-present, which goes over in the change from the transcendence of self-future as a constant point of fulfilling, by this transcendence changing into proper immanence. Present is constituted in an intentionality of fulfilling, in which alone the “intentional object” is simultaneously united with the consciousness of it, that is, the coming-within-the-point-of-fulfilling.

I am - I am the one I am within lasting, and I am as that always already within this mode of being of a manifold continuous transcendence of my primal modal being as Now.

Momentary primal actuality, which already implies a grown past and future, that is, already includes a transcendence itself; and I am within streaming, a self-transcending is continuously performed within streaming, namely a constituting some past, in which that, which just now has been current present with all its momentary transcendences, receives <some> modification, has constituted in a transcending way that preceding present as a new present therein, and thus always within streaming ever [131] again. Of course the description of the intentional coincidence and transcendent formation of unity is missing: The streaming is a continuous genesis, in which unity is constituted through streaming away, and standing present remains, in which the history of genesis finding constantly its expression lies in historical modifications.

This is the “primordium” in its first temporalization, in its first way of being of creating a temporal transcendence, which is constituted in a primal way in standing present, and always already has been constituted; “is constituted” – in the streaming away, in the constituting ever new present and new future from the already constituted past; “and always already has been constituted”, insofar as past always has its primal instituting intentional modification in present, and this always already has predelineated future, that is, [insofar as] future consciousness is already a piece of content in present.

How can the primordium still perform further temporalization? This first temporalization was a continuous temporalization coming about through the not ceasing streaming as an invariant form of being of the primordium. All “performances” as conscious performances of the Ego, which is nothing but a primordium, must simply perform within it; the continuous primal temporalization creates a temporal unity, that is, a transcendent being in the continuously intentional coincidence of intentional modifications of the same, genetically deriving from the primal mode. The streaming being of the primordium is being through the modes of primal presentiation – modes of presentiation of the first step. But if we go back to the primal Now, having changed and changing in these (retentional and protentional) modes, then we had the streaming standing world perception preferred as content of the same. But this does not need to make up this Now alone. While living in the constancy of world perception, I can have memories at the same time, recollections, anticipations.

As moments within the primal Now, which changes retentionally and protentionally, they take part in this change and are always co-existent within streaming with the changes of world perception, the way they are present simultaneously with it in the primal Now.

A new chapter of the theme self-temporalization and through self-temporalization world temporalization so to say begins with the memories.

At first, world perception anyway belongs to the primal Now, differing as such from any kind of memory in an essential way. This is a presentiation of something not-present in a quite different way, [132] being itself within the primal present in primal present consciousness, but in itself transcending towards a non-present consciousness. Thus I also go beyond myself by that, and the transcendent again is my own being, but in the mode past – memorial past, as we initially say. Recollection on the other hand is simply not an intentional modification, springing, or rather, having sprung in constant streaming, making up my primordium, and if intentional modification shall be called consciousness, in itself referring to the consciousness, from which it derives, from which it has sprung, then we initially have no exhibition for such a kind. We cannot say up till now that memory in this sense is an intentional modification. Or, which is the same: that this memorial past is such a matter of course in us – the question is, from where – as a having-beenness of myself, which necessarily has been born and has become from present making it, the past one, objective; nay, we will say accordingly: The present, when it was present, had to sink by law of streaming away and has become past, to which I can have recourse, which I can remember, and possibly remember, and thus every memory refers back to the primal becoming of past through re-intentionalizing; to the awakening of the same, which then only presentiates as an intuitional recollection that which originally has been present and only has sunken into the becoming-unconscious.

Anyway, memory, different memories emerge in primal present as discretions, as single mental processes, experiencing their constant retentional change like other mental livings. This change does not deliver new memories, but continuous retentions of one and the same memory.

[133]
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<The breaking in of a memory into a continuous process of perception can lead to a “covering” of the perception (and vice versa). The reduction to last perceptions in the sense of hyletic data>

1. Going back from the epoché to the concrete stream with the world phenomenon. 2) If we consider the concrete immanent stream, constantly temporalizing itself as the first ontic in contrast to the first noetic (stream of time modalities). We have the world appearances in this first ontic – also a stream, that of “mental livings of perception” and of their time of mental living, then the “pure” perceptual appearances, but also appearances of recollection, also of course as verifying, verbally formed thoughts, etc. 3) Reduction to the world’s appearance of perception; but there we notice that the stream of mental living <has> a peculiarity; it proceeds for some stretch and then “an intuitional presentiation breaks in”, that is, an intuitional recollection, in which the recollected is a recollected mental living, as that belonging to some concrete recollected present; recollected present is constituted in a recollected way in recollected time modalities, belonging to the recollected standing streaming with all peculiarities of such a one.

But the original, not recollected, the perceptual process is not dead during this process. What does the “breaking through” there mean, and what does the inevitable talking mean, that recollection itself belonged to the perceptual current realm of mental processes, it was itself a present and not presentiated mental living, it presentiated, but that which is presentiated within it was past, the presentiated was present.

I may be lost in recollections, sunken, then I do not have any perceptual present, it is “covered”. And still I have it as well, simply as a covered one. The other way round: recollection “turns up”, but it is not sufficiently “vivid”, it is covered by perception, but simply again “covered”.

If we abstract the occurrence of presentiation, this layer of covering, then we had a total perception streaming in an uncovered way, or rather, a stream of mental living in a perceptual [134] “originality”, a perceptually filled time in perceptual time modalities. It is a constant constituting-unity through association, but an association, which reigns in a constituting way in the “first originality” (the immanent one), is a constant continuity of fusion as a constant primal original streaming in different regard, and creates a unity in the primal original time’s form of continuity, within which its special unities are “mental processes”.

In the presentiating modification of perception, if we take it for itself in an abstractive way and explicated in a vivacity “full of sights”, continuity of the streaming “is repeated” with all its performances. It is an association in modification, a modified time, a presentiated one, constituting a remembered one in recollection. The association is a union through “coincidence of identity” on both sides or coincidence in distant self-identity, i.e. equality or uniting in the change of similarity.

But we need to say now: The whole “impressional-original” time sphere abstractively taken out is my current total world perception, perception of the world in the time mode world present. Likewise thus every world memory, taken completely in a concrete way, becomes a representation of some past world present. World though is a spatiotemporal world; perception of something worldly in apperceptive perception; the spatiotemporal coexistence being perceptual there, is not an immanent, purely perceptual temporalization, as a single space object is not a unit of a “mental process”. Thus a new reduction becomes necessary. The mental living of the spatio-worldly perception is perception of the thing through “apperception”. How do we reduce to pure perception, how do we free ourselves in an abstractive way from the “horizons”, from presentiations as functioning along? Here a hierarchical structure of apperceptive functions shows itself, and in the unbuilding, resulting in ever new relative perception, we arrive at final perceptions, which are no longer apperceptive ones: the hyletic fields and data.

In the final hyletic primal sphere there is only identification in continuously differentiating intentional modification, it is the intentional modification of “retention”, the constant depresentiation, we could say, as a change of similarity making up succession of temporalization in a streaming way, and as a process constantly creating a unifying of identity in this succession. But this only holds true in the temporalization of the hyletic-primal perceptual sphere – as a primal original temporalization, and in the modification of the respective presentiation.

[135] We have the basic layer pure world perception in the stream prior to the unbuilding just now hinted at. What kind of association is it and in what way does it function, so that it creates for us a perceived world as a stream of mental living of worldly perception in the streaming immanent association? But initially we consider that which presents itself immanently as a stream.

But now a completely new kind of association and together with it a new kind of temporalization approaches us under the title of covering and presentiation <in> the modification called recollection.

“Presentiation” is a quite changing intentional modification (the now clear, now unclear being-presentiated), which in this change – taking place itself continuously – presentiates the same. This continuity creates, as long as presentiation takes place, a layer of the vivid primal streaming, which is associated with the layer of the primal original, the primal perceptual streaming. Or two temporalizations coincide, an original one and a modified, presentiated one. This coincidence implies a union, but not some identification, as if time were the same – similarly to a coincidence lying within a pairing in the original present sphere, but at the same time a discreeting.

How about that, which we called “covering” above? The connection through pairing is one, the counter-tension, the struggle between the field of presentiation and the field of perception, of the streamingly constituting presentiating with the streamingly constituting perceiving, is something else. And yet within this conflict both are one.

But it <is> not that simple. The perception proceeds and during its process a recollection turns up at one place, initially in a quite unclear way, [it] breaks in, the past is “woken up”. During the retentional process, while a successively configured series is still fading away, recollection can begin. We have the layer of fading away prior to that.

[136]
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<Reduction to pure self-perception, to my perceptual present under parenthesizing of memory and expectation>[[11]](#footnote-11)

In the natural attitude: 1) I am given to myself in a perceptual way. I perform a reduction to pure self-perception, to that, which I find of me myself exclusively as something perceived and perceivable. The structure belongs there: Consciousness and therein ever again also perceiving the spatial world and world conscious or rather perceived “purely as such” within consciousness. But on top of that something else as well. E.g. my will to bring to bear nothing else but something purely perceived belongs there as well.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Better thus: In the purely reduced self-perception I have a world consciousness, therein necessarily a perceiving one. Presentiating world- [137] consciousness joins in, connects with it as possibly discovering the respective horizon, obviously, and this joining and discovering, explicating belongs to my self-perception.

It needs to be noted now, that I, reducing my self-consciousness to pure self-perception, distinguish also with regard to myself between proper self-perception and presentiations of myself, and I need to consider, what reduction to something self-perceptual properly means. I am conscious of myself as temporally being. If I reduce to self-perception, I reduce to my perceptual present. The recollection brings me my past present and not my actually current one to self-givenness. But it is itself as my current mental living a piece of content of my perceptual present and likewise any other self-consciousness, which is not self-perception. The realm of self-perception implies all self-consciousness as perceived and perceptible, every recollection, expectation, any aiming meaning and doing positing a purpose, etc.

But reduction to self-perception shall mean: only that, which attributes self-perception, an actual and possible one, as something perceived or perceptible, shall win acceptance, serve in descriptions, which I simply as such intend within the reduction. Thus I take into account every recollection, a worldly one or self-memory, every self-presentiation and every self-consciousness else exclusively as something self-perceived, something made accepted as being my own in self-perception. In contrast to that all that shall be excluded, which recollections and other ways of consciousness make accepted; or otherwise put: instead of having the recollected in the same acceptance as the perceived and thereby treat my judging doings in the same way, like [I do] at other times when I live recollections, shall now only the self-perceived win being-acceptance in my phenomenological intent. All other, not self-perceiving ways of consciousness, shall only win being-acceptance as something self perceived, simply as contents of my perceptual being, but not with regard to that, which they accept consciously and in normal attitude.

Obviously though it belongs itself to my present being, always as purely perceptual present, that the now emerging and proceeding recollection with regard to my past has this and that content, e.g., that it was among others a perception of these and [138] those world objects, and that it “means” this content in the time modality proper past and in the acceptance modality certainty. The recollection “means” that, and I am then, performing it in a normal way, the one actually living in this certainty of being – but now it is said within the reduction: This recollection exclusively belongs to the content of pure self-present and all that, which “is accepted” in it. This acceptance (my acceptance) related to past in it belongs to my present, and I only take it into account as that. Thus I exclusively undertake to bring to acceptance and to talking pure self-present, and to become at first certain in an apodictic way, that everything I mean and say with regard to my own past, with regard to [my own] future, I must find as a content of the reduced self-perception that, <which> is respectively meaning and saying, if I simply perform self-perception in a reflecting way and reduce it; but also that everything which I else respectively mean and say, may it regard nature or mind, man or animal, sky or earth, god or the angels, belongs to the respective pure self-perceptual present according to meaning and something meant as such.[[13]](#footnote-13)

No. 35

<Note: reflection on my options within the frame of reduction to streaming present>

I reduce to my streaming present being, that is, I behave in a purely perceiving way, constantly, but I also reflect and I keep on <reflecting> repeatedly, I else practice, e.g. within worldliness, but by reducing world acceptance, my human acting and doing.

I thereby perform <a> coming back to <that>, which I formerly experienced, and I can also reflect on my just now performed reflection in its still-vivacity and apprehend it as belonging to my vivid present. I can furthermore go over from that, which I am doing right now to the making objective that which I could do, design options, change options in the flow of proceeding life – and reflectively apprehend this ability and designing as belonging to it, but also think of options from there of my proceeding life in its options of process [139] being concretely reshaped. I can do the same with[[14]](#footnote-14) my recollected streaming thoughts. In a reductive attitude – the transcendental epoché – I can grasp streaming life – but my complete life present is never grasped in such a way.

I could also say: To make myself reflectively a theme in the epoché is *eo ipso* self-perception and perception of my transcendental self. And it does not stop to be the same perception, if I reflectively perceive the reflection, and thus continuously and incrementally demonstrate in the process of perception exactly my own perceptual being according to its actualities and options: demonstrate it to me. These options themselves belong to my being, to my present [being] itself – inseparably. They are necessarily meant along with my perceiving myself, thus in their way they are meant along, like my past. What is then streaming present?

No. 36

<Reduction to the Ego of pure self-perception>[[15]](#footnote-15)

Investigating sense on me myself I simply perform “self-investigation”, self-consciousness, and self-intuition seeking clarity, self-perception, self-memory, self-thinking, etc. I perform, from which motives ever, a reduction to pure self-investigation, I can also say pure self-cognition, the aim of which lies in answering, that is, cognition answering the question: Who am I myself in my pure own essence? A reduction to pure self-perception belongs in the frame of such pure self-investigation, the cognition aim of the pure self reduces to my pure self-present, my primal streaming living present.

Certainly, I have exactly this doing of the giving-acceptance-to by reducing and now positing in acceptance the reduced, this streaming present incrementally in the specialties, which can be brought to light in it, more concretely put: the reduced perceiving with all that belonging to the reduced doing, not itself as co-exhibited in the streaming pure self-present. [140] But as soon as I “reflect” this doing, turning back my view, I pre-find it and I also pre-find the “thus I am able to ever again”. It is indeed respectively not perceived, but perceptible, ready for currently thematizing perception, and thus becomes co-thematic – and thematizable as content of my own being as streamingly primal present, in which I am and I am for me, iteratively currently present and with a horizon of iterative present ability and then currently becoming-present of that, which I am and already am with the respective actual activity. But basically we go beyond the reduced self-present thereby.

Here the problem of methods emerges: I reduce in “naivety”, in <the> intent to describe primal present and to thereby gain a lasting knowledge of it, of my thus reduced being, cognition. But within streaming this present flows and offers ever new contents. If I say that, I already go beyond the de facto streaming present. I have changed the recollections of something past. I come back in a repeating way to the same past, thus identifying and distinguishing on the basis of acts, ways of consciousness, transgressing the reduced sphere in their acceptance of being.

Furthermore: I do not want to know about this momentarily self-perceived, I want to gain general, essentially general cognition for the structure of a living present as such, of its unconditioned-general form and the form of its options in the streaming change.

Which sense does the reduction to the Ego of pure self-perception thus have? How do I reduce that I find eidetic insights into my streaming primal absolute self-present – as the one in which everything happens which is originally my own, all my being accepted, all my performance creating a being sense, [performance] in which I am myself the one I am, and in which everything being for me, gains sense as streamingly-present-being from me, from my “absolute” sense?

[141]
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<Note: The discovering of the being sense and the world’s temporal and spatial way of givenness>

Thus[[16]](#footnote-16) I find de facto, investigating sense, the world being for me, in which I live: This world is being for me in a core of being experienced and a horizon of something not experienced. The horizonness characterizes everything I can lay claim to as something actually experienced, as actually grasped and to be grasped. Everything has its inner and outer horizon, as option that it might be brought to the experiencing apprehension as something co-existing, co-accepted.

Self-investigation, namely investigation sense with regard to the world as respectively being accepted by me purely from experience here means: systematic discovery of the horizons, discovery of the being sense world simply as respectively being from experience implied in the horizonness as attendant meaning. If I perform, as is a matter of course here, the questioning of the horizon meaning with regard to the most general, then it aims at the formally-general of this world as a respective experiential world for me as such the way I thus find it now, and have found ever again, and will find, or rather, must be able to find.

The world as respectively being experienced for me, and everything I experience as worldly, has a temporal way of givenness. The primal shape of the same (the primal mode) is the one as streaming perceptual present with the horizonness streamingly belonging to it, that of time modalities.[[17]](#footnote-17)

[142]Well, first of all: That which can be found in every vivid present as an individual form, in every present I find the “perceptual space” of the world, the “perceptual field” as a simultaneous form, that is, as a continuously present one. I find it as a continuous worldly perceptual present in my continuous “egological”, “subjective” present, and more closely, in a subjective present specifically belonging to it. As this I find the continuous unity of spatio-worldly “appearances”, in which continuously worldly present appears.

Closer description of this correlation of experiencing and something experienced, perception and something perceived.[[18]](#footnote-18)

That which can be found in the same way as a form in every present, is, more closely, <the> perceptual field as a field of spatial objects, of *res extensae*, and in the continuity of successivity every *res*, persisting unity, of which we have to inquire the unitary structure within the structure of plurality. <There is a > synthesis in this continuity of the momentary perceptual spaces belonging to every phase and of the synthetically-unitary form perceptual space, which continues by synthetically enlarging as a form for the plurality, which <is> a spatial configuration of the single things perceptually appearing in the phases, as continuously persisting, but exiting from the field as respectively appearing, re-entering, etc. The persisting thing itself as resting or changing. The subjective: the appearances – in their “subjective” temporality.

The appearances in their relation to the kin<aesthetics> - this leads to the ability-I. The egoical as such. Act, ability, habituality, acquiring, keeping.

[143]
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<Note:> Simultaneous and successive configuration

Degree of the pairing’s intimacy, of the configuration for mere immanent data – degree of the similarity up to equality. There is no equality for local data. Degree in continuous fusion towards the extensive unity in the simultaneity.

Problem of the configuration’s intimacy in apperceived unities.

Perceptual field and sinking.

Perceptual field in the simultaneity of the originally arising Now – the primal impressional simultaneity (in the hyletic-primal impressional sphere: unity of a respective hyletic field).

Simultaneity of the retentional momentary continuity – which makes up the unity of a momentary simultaneity with the originally arising Now and its primal impressional simultaneity.

But here the problem of this momentary field’s range <lies>. If this streaming totality of the immanent present is a limited field of a limited persisting field form in the standing streaming, a standing “Now” with a standing continuity of retentional differences – how about that, which has become “unconscious”, <which> is completely sunken? Is it gone from the field with the solid form? What is the disappearing of the retention? Retentions as moments of simultaneity, retention as “consciousness of”. Does the retention have the character of a “date” in the simultaneity, as <a> phase in the field within the primal impressional sphere of the field, according to the form thus a local phase in the continuous local field, thus in the enlarged present field, field of retention up to the Now (and of protention), and the single retention a local phase of this field? But <is there> a degree here towards the limit zero? Does eventually in the standing streaming each of the retentional intentionalities vanish thus in continuously disappearing, whereby though the simultaneous continuity of the retentional grades towards zero remain rigid in every moment, which makes an end, but not a limit, delimiting against something else?

The retentions as “appearances of”, the “identity” of the “appearing”, of that, which is retentionally conscious. Continuous “coincidence of identity” and still impoverishment in the “distinctness”, impoverishment in the different depiction of the depicted. Do the retentional “data”, mental livings, have proper similarity, change of similarity, melting of similarity? What does this mean?

[144] Every primal impressional “date” has its locality in the primal impressional field. The localities have their own fusions, making up the field. Founded therein: the fusions of the localized towards distinct unities, towards data in the field.

With regard to retentionality: every impressional date (and each of its localized moments) has its retentionality in streaming, so that a proper retentional primal date and retentionally declining continuity go along with every primal impressional local date (as its retentional change). But all moments belonging to the different simultaneous local data of the primal impression in the streaming in unitary continuity are completely equal and fused as that, and thus the unitary form of the temporal at-the-same-time is one with the primal impressional field. This at-the-same-time continuously changes towards the zero.

No. 39

<I myself and the world of my perception in streaming present>

I talk with regard to the world of the streaming perceptual present, as being perceived by me. On the other hand though also of me as the perceiving I. I am within the streaming perceiving of the world and I am as such in the streaming consciousness life, which is a manifold consciousness life and therein a conscious mental living of something worldly and of world as such – therein again in a peculiarity of streaming mental living, simply the perceiving. According to my self-perception I am thus in streaming present. I have a reflective, I have self-consciousness by reflecting on me, and therein in speciality a self-perceiving one and preferring pure self-perception, only bringing this to bear, that is, exclusively and purely on that, which is perceptually given by me, as an I originally looking there myself and making it speak, I find myself in the form of streaming self-present. This then implies as a component of my streaming mentally living being the streaming world-perceiving in my streaming Now the perceiving-world-now and therein again as something perceived (in the We of the perceptual meantness) the world-Now. Something meant along belongs to this, reduced to the properly and actually perceived: to the actually perceived world present a present horizon, [145] a worldly co-present as meant along, but not actually self-given world-present; furthermore a horizon of co-accepted world past and co-accepted world future. I have world in streaming temporalization as a perceived world though, a temporal world, in my streaming perceiving, but in the streaming change of time modalities – present, past, future -, and in a streaming change of ways of temporalization, according to the continuously changing modes, that which presents itself perceptually according to something properly perceived as itself-properly-present and horizonlike meant along. But the world time is in constant “constitution” in this streaming change, or rather, the temporally being world for me, that is, in perceiving. The unity of becoming conscious goes constantly through the change of having conscious. The same, which emerges in the temporal mode of givenness Now, is streamingly conscious as something past and ever-again-past and still as the same, keeping its identical time point in this selfness. And thus in general: “the” world is called perceived, the same in its self time, while this selfness presents itself in a modally streaming way in that which is perceived.

On the other hand: I, the I perceiving this world itself and in its time modalities, am myself, that is, temporally for me myself and temporally from self-temporalization. I find myself in a reflecting way in the time modalities present, past and future, that is, self-perceptually as a streaming present and streaming with a constant horizon, in which my past and future is constantly, although in a changing way, meant along. But let us not disregard this likeness of form too fleetingly; that world and I myself are experienced in time modalities, the world in world perception as streaming world present, I <in> the self-perception as streaming self-present: thus we soon venture to the “primal phenomenon”, which has never been brought out, let alone systematically explicated, in which everything which may else be called a phenomenon and in what sense ever, has its source. It is the standingly streaming self-present, or rather, the absolute I being streamingly present to itself in its standingly streaming life, a life, which is a constantly streaming mental living, intentionality, having conscious, implying a standingly streaming acceptance of being in manifold modalities and modalities of a quite different character and sense, acceptance of being with content or sense, which itself belongs into the content of the streaming.

[146]
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Ad theme and epoché. <Also in pure self-perceiving the world remains a universal horizon>

I am directed towards myself in a perceiving way, purely towards myself as <the one> I perceive, and the way I perceive myself. To perceive is the way of consciousness, in which that, which is conscious therein, shows itself as itself. It shows “itself” as if it was calling: I am here myself, originally, quite immediately I myself; thus showing-oneself is not in the first place a testifying-oneself, when the word <sounds> pointing towards an indirect showing with the help of any “witnesses”. In general perceiving is a being-perceivingly-at-something-itself, but it also has the “being-there” in the correlate of the it-itself as a perceived one. I am certain of the perceived as being in a perceiving way, it is just in contrast to other certainties of being a certainty exactly with the content, in which simply the “being” is given as being there itself. No <meaning> getting closer, no empty pre-meaning, no pre-suspecting, no presenting itself analogically in symbols, in pictures, no showing-itself, but simply consciousness of the thing itself, of the self, which is the consciousness here.

Self-perceiving now means, since the self here already expresses the I-self, perceiving me myself, having-a-hold-of-me-myself in the showing-me-myself. And I, as this for-me, am the originally being-there for me.

But the perception shall be pure self-perception. This means, I do not want to take anything else in this certainty of being, which has not been perceived actually and properlyin self-perception. I thus put out of action, out of performance all co-meaning, which beyond that apportions a perceptual sense to me in usual first person speaking, in which I apperceive myself as I, this man, in such a way that I thus limit my current acceptance of being as the one, which exclusively determines the judgments regarding myself. But I only want to judge me and me in this restriction, or rather, I only want to direct my perceiving and my pure perceiving on that and give acceptance to the perceived as being. At first it seems that I first of all restrict the world perception, which I constantly have running as an I investigating sense, thus being awake, to the perception of the special real object, which I, a man among other real ones of the world, am, and now furthermore restrict the perception of this real object [147] to that, which arrives at the actual self-giving in pure perception.

I now consider the following: I can certainly make a single object an “exclusive theme”, I can certainly temporally restrict my perceiving and judging to an object and I do this anyway ever again in the process of the perceiving life, where an object interests me especially, and, as I am used to say, just “exclusively”. But this exclusivity does not in any way mean that the other world is not as well accepted and the being field in advance, the one being accepted by me in a constant certainty of being as that, in which this exclusively interesting thing is. Every experiential object in current experience is in the “belief” of experience, i.e., in the experience’s certainty of being, here of the original one, of the perception, in the “form” of spatial temporality belonging to it, i.e., as being accepted in its temporal spatial place; and in its own-essential determinations (its own characteristics) is already implied that they are being at this point as causal ones, as being causally determined through the real things external of them (their “circumstances”). One thus realizes that the being-for-itself of an object as something being accepted from experience necessarily has in co-acceptance the world external of it, that it thus, as the total experience, in which world is experienced as a totality, implies the acceptance of the single worldly objects in the total acceptance, likewise also the other way round, just in another way, every single experiential acceptance implies the total one. On the constant ground of total acceptance only a limited experience is conceivable, a special experience as stressing, possibly abstracting.

To accordingly consider myself exclusively as a man, and to inquire that, which is properly perceived by me does not mean to “not consider” the world in a serious sense. The “seriously not considering” the world in its totality is something quite different, whereas I inevitably perceive it as an awake I, performing such leaving-unconsidered.

But is this not a contradiction, since perceiving is a belief of being of the perceived, that is, the unitary perceiving of the awake life with all its combinations of special perceptions, in which the world is perceived, although in respectively changing fields of perception with changing single objects (as the respectively perceived in a proper way of “the” world), is constantly being there, the universe, in which everything is, also being accepted as a universal form of the space temporality, in which every being has its place? Still, as true as this is, it is also true, that it is possible to inhibit every performance of the world acceptance, that is, of all perception in [148] one. As soon as I, being engaged with any worldly object, am interested in something worldly, that is, in any theoretical or practical doing, the world totality is already, as I have pointed out above, in co-acceptance; as of course everywhere I have in universal attitude the world as a whole (for example as a scientist, as an ontologist in the old sense) as a theme.

But if I turn off every world interest, I put it out of action – similarly as I temporally put interests I have out of action within worldliness, for example the political interest while doing my job, the interest for the job while caring for bringing up, etc. – thus a universal theme still remains to me, that is, in the theoretical attitude of the philosophizing: I myself, and not now I, the man, the being, woven into the causal connection of its realities.

How is it now to be discerned that indeed this epoché, with regard to the performance of acceptance of the universal world acceptance and above all of the universal experience, of the world perception evermore practiced in the awake life, is to be carried out in such a way, that now more than ever a perceptual field and thereby a judgment field remains, or rather, that now a completely new window opens, that evermore new positings of being and assertions of being contents are made possible, which from the beginning and always remain free from the performance of the world’s positing of being, in which all naively-natural activity is kept?

No. 41

<The invariant time form of the primal streaming life in all modes of world- and self-perception>

Which[[19]](#footnote-19) egological time point ever I regard, I always find the same form, the temporalizingly temporalized form of my life as continuously repeating itself. Exactly through this - continuous – repetition temporal existence is continuously constructed as something unitary respectively in the source point Now.

The living, original repetition is a continuously verifying repetition, also verifying the repetition – thus is temporal constitution. My temporally original being, my being as [149] temporalizingly-temporalized life stream (and therein I as a centre, as I of this stream), is concrete as the continuously fulfilled invariant time form. The content making up world perceiving, as the one temporalized therein, as this egological content has itself, as temporalizing world, an invariant form and content.

More precisely: the world being for me is constituted with the world time in the layer of my primal streaming life, making up my constant world perceiving, in the world temporal modalities and in its content, with the help of which world itself is for me as fulfilled time, but presenting itself modally in a worldly temporal way, or presenting in the streaming change of fulfilled temporally modal form, which remains itself invariant as a form.

Repeated otherwise: I find myself investigating sense as a mentally living I, and if I first abstract from world being simply there for me in this mental living, then I find the general stream of my mentally living life in its abstract peculiarity of form. I can respectively direct the reflectively apprehending view on this mentally living stream and its form and explicate it. Thus I now find the modes of that, which I call my immanent egological temporality, my “respective Now”, my continuously streaming away having-just-now-beenness, and likewise[[20]](#footnote-20) the horizon of the right-now-coming.

This formal is thus invariantly persisting in the streaming, and exactly thereby it is continuously conscious in an identical way as a form, in coincidence with itself in continuous streaming and distinguished by the same. Immanent temporalization is continuously “original associative” coincidence and thereby an invariant, always necessary constitution of a necessarily distinguished constituted unity. But the content of this form changes, and in contrast to the continuous unity of coincidence the differing content is distinguished. An invariant form is in one in streaming <and> and a varying content and thus it creates a lasting concrete unity as the same changing its content.

I find myself continuously in my vividly mentally living present in the immanence of my streaming Ego and in this directly experiential present I have contents of simultaneity. I am now experiencing, in my now streaming life, thinking, feeling, thus and thus, however, in an active, suffering way, etc.

I now, the one investigating sense, of course also have in this originally conscious, immanent life the sense-investigative doing, in which thus all, which has just now been established [150] becomes conscious thematically, and among this is counted itself again this sense-investigative doing itself. It is of course a problem how this happens and can happen, this relating-back-to-oneself and <the> doing-relating-back-to-the-relating-back-itself – but initially it is not its turn yet. Enough, obviously it happens. I abstracted above from my concrete being, the way it is conscious as a mentally living one, is experienced, if we understand by experiencing the originally having-conscious, that is, irrespective of an apprehending view being directed to it or not. We thus used this difference from the beginning, the option, the ability (the I-can) of the experiencing-apprehending reflection; and if we direct the sense-investigative performing of this reflection, as we may again, to an already performed first reflection, that is, in repetition, then the first reflecting with its content soon joins the concretely living I in its original present.

We differ now this original present itself and the world present mentally lived in the mentally living life (mentally living in the stream of the I-live). The original living present is that, which is actually experienced by me in the concrete Now, and it is that, as we said, in a horizon of non-experience. In that, which is conscious as world, we have again the difference of that, which is properly, originally experienced of the world, and the experiential horizon.

Here[[21]](#footnote-21) the sentence holds true: My concrete present anyway has the form of originally experienced experiencing, anyway the form of perceived perceiving.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Furthermore: Ways of experience being intentional modifications of perception need not emerge as distinguished mental livings. But anyway, whether they do or not, it is a realm of “self-perception”, in which no such modification appears. (Every recollection for example has a background anyway, a combined realm of perception). This now equally <holds true> for the experiencing world consciousness: In my egological experiential realm, as that of my original being-conscious-for-me-myself, I find myself as experiencing world. It is now inconceivable that I do not find myself in self-examination as experiencing world in my mental livings, and therein again in a necessarily proceeding, a continuously streaming field of perception. However still memories, [151], still perception’s modes of change may appear, there is necessarily a world field as perceptual field. Necessarily the horizon, which is to be explicated more closely, is, as with regard to my immanent perceptual field thus with regard to this intentional perceptual field in the immanence – a horizon of not-having-experienced but experienceability, as the explication shows.

Before we go on, a distinction: <we differ> for my concrete Ego and for the world (on both sides) under the title experiencing-as-originally-having-conscious a double sense. The perceived is experienced, in a double sense originally conscious. It is the primal mode of originality, for example with regard to that, which is experienced as world in the living egological present, the perceptual – concretely the respective perceptual field. But an intuitional recollection, e.g. a melody, which is now vividly recollected in an intuitional way, is also originally conscious in its way. I remember it itself.

But this remembering is a mediate mode of the having-something-conscious-as-it-itself in a certain singular way. It is a having-conscious, in which a modification of perception is “implied”. This implies the being past, the having-been-perceived, and at the same time an as-if-I-perceive-it-once-again, whereas I do not perceive it actually right now.

I have a remembering-them instead of a simple perceiving the respective melody in the concrete egological present, and this remembering is for its part originally in this present, that is, perceptually, conscious. But there is something egologically past conscious in and with it, namely “my former perceiving the melody”. Thus, we have in one, <that is> not only for the worldly experiencing in the egological present, a distinguished primal originality as perception and a secondary one as recollection, but this difference also with regard to the concrete living present as pure experiential present.

We also see that the basic difference of having-perceived – perception and “intentional modification” of perception[[23]](#footnote-23) - , related to something worldly, can only happen by its being entangled in a respective concrete egological difference, that of egological perception and intentional modification of it.[[24]](#footnote-24)

[152] We derive from[[25]](#footnote-25) that which has been argued, now in a formulating way, a main sentence, <that is> this one: I am in standing streaming as someone continuously experiencing myself, i.e., for me myself as I myself originally conscious – but, as stated above, within a horizon of something-not-experienced-itself.

We wish to now let our systematic proceeding of “reductions” determine. A first reduction is the one, in which I, as someone apprehending in a sense-investigating way, direct the view to the perceptual field, to the streaming realm of that, which is proper to me as my (streamingly) experienced, that is, purely according to that, which has been experienced by me. Accordingly, that, which is conscious to me, at the same time conscious to me as belonging to me, but is not present as it itself, as experienced present, remains unconsidered. Secondly though I reduce to primal experience, to perception. I thus take myself in a relatively concrete way as given in perception.

Reduction to me myself as the “pure” Ego of the pure Ego life, as in which all my having-conscious, the perceiving one, remembering one, etc. of each and everything lies, which is for me in any sense and any mode of the being-accepted-by-me. Thus, whatever is being for me, is accepted by me as that, has ever been accepted or will be accepted, is something being-accepted by me in my acceptance, having or assuming this or that sense, in which it is accepted, in my ways of consciousness. I reduce to this universal consciousness life, which is my life, which I bring to bear purely as such, concretely, the way it implies a conscious, supposed sense and mode of acceptance, e.g. certainty, doubtfulness, etc. I reduce – I reckon only this, “make only this currently accepted”, in ways of experience, of perception, of presentiation, etc. But what does this mean: “to make only this accepted”?

[153]

No. 42

<Note:> Primordial reduction

Nothing is known yet of the primordiality, which still is stopped through the demand of perception (of the correlative perception). Many things remain undetermined there: everything that is not a correlate of the perceptual field “of the world”. We already have the I and the here conspicuous abilities and kinaesthetic. But [we do not have] the concretely human I, which lives, acts, is occupied with the world in a worldly way. We can (or have to?) draw it into only in so far, as we are standing within the egological vivid present and possible present as such (initially in the one, which is de facto past and future); and “reduction” here means exclusion of the horizon-like, going beyond the correlatively streaming perception. But this reduction indeed results in the primordial – prior to all introduction of the transcendental other ones.

I am attendant in all experience and in all experiencing, bodily, my body <is> always the center through this time and world. My body, my reigning I <is> within the body and thereby within the world, which I experience, and which I here consider purely as an experienced (perceptual) one. I as a man in this primordiality.

The other men within the frame of my experience. Something new begins here, and we arrive from there immediately at the perceptual world in the new sense of our world, our [world] as human world, but as a co-human one of experience. Then soon the space becomes a human territory, a living place, etc. and we step on the ground of history.
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