

CHAPTER EIGHT INTERSUBJECTIVE TEMPORALITY

A REVIEW OF THE ARGUMENT

My work up until now has meant to establish the foundations of a notion for which Husserl's analyses opened the door. I have shown that, at each level of temporalizing consciousness, there exists a connection to an intersubjective structure and content, and I have suggested that this connection be called "intersubjective temporality." Here I will review the accomplishments of each chapter, bringing these individual arguments together to create the complete picture of intersubjective temporality as understood from the paradigm of Husserlian phenomenology. I will present the individual arguments, placing them alongside one another in order to show their overall contribution to a phenomenological understanding of intersubjectivity. Each individual aspect of temporalizing consciousness reveals its own link to intersubjectivity, and in the same way that the different functions of temporalizing consciousness interrelate with one another, so too do their individual links with an intersubjective structure and content work together to establish intersubjective temporality.

I began chapter one with an analysis of the Urimpression and then of the living present. This established that the Urimpression can only be understood as an abstract, hypothetical notion, "pure immediate impression," but that we could never experience this Urimpression as such nor could we discuss it without admitting its dependence upon retention and protention. On the other hand, the living present is understood as the living, constituting level of consciousness that stretches beyond any immediate presence, and in its activity, constitutes our experiences as temporal. In chapter two, I turned to discuss an argument made by Dan Zahavi, that objective constitution indicates an intersubjective structure through its reference to the object's "mundane" horizons as well as to broader, "transcendental" horizons of meaning. Zahavi points out that, if I am experiencing an object as a whole, then I am necessarily appresenting the infinite number of profiles of that object that are not directly present to me, and these profiles are the perspectives and meanings that could only be had by other subjects at this moment. As such, the absent profiles indicate an open, intersubjective horizon, and they therefore link me with intersubjectivity. This description would begin to explain Husserl's reference to our world as co-constituted by

me and others, as well as to a "transcendental intersubjectivity." This "transcendental intersubjectivity," according to Zahavi, is indicated through my experiences of transcendent objects. In chapter three, I turned to a related question: How, if the world is co-constituted by a multitude of subjects (each with his own temporalizing consciousness), are we all able to have *the same now*? Since Husserl had mentioned a notion called "world-time" several times in his later manuscripts, I considered it as a possible solution. World-time, I found, is an intersubjectively constituted present, arising from all individual constituting consciousnesses. It is the synthetic link of all temporalizing consciousnesses, making a world-present together. Since it is the constituted presence of all consciousness, it is not reducible to any individual inner time-consciousness, although the now is the same for both; it is based in my temporalizing consciousness just as it is based in all others. Thus world-time is the level of synthesizing consciousness between any individual now-consciousness and what we understand as objective, scientific, or "clock" time.

In chapters four and five, I carried out a careful analysis of retention, and discovered that the different functions of retention can be divided into two main categories, called "near" and "far" retention by Husserl. Near retention is primarily involved in the active, immediate constitution of the living present. In other words, near retention is involved in constituting the objects and meanings we are encountering currently. Near retention "holds onto" the experience of what is immediately present as it passes, making it possible for us to understand what is currently transpiring. Far retention, since it is interrelated with near retention, also contributes to current constitution; this it does by maintaining the general "memories" that contribute to our everyday recognition of identities and types, and synthesizing them with current experiences. This means that far retention holds onto the typification of similar objects and patterns in past experiences, helping to constitute related objects or patterns that are present. In addition to this function, far retention maintains primordial foundations, which are the major discoveries, decisions, new skills, etc., that become part of us even after we have forgotten about them. For example, my having learned how to type is not something I regularly recollect, but this ability is always passively present, and it is activated (without being specifically recalled) whenever I sit at a typewriter or computer. These primordial foundations allow for the possibility of certain activities, such as some types of association, since we relate these past momentous occasions to similar ones that arise in the present. The analysis of far retention, finally, revealed that the genetic structure of consciousness also contains a primordial foundation of intersubjectivity: The genetic structure is the foundation of such activities of constitution as apperception

and association, and these activities link us to the perspectives of other subjects. They do this by opening us up to intersubjective meaning and by leading us to the horizons of perspectives held by other subjects. Both the typifications of our recognition of other perspectives belonging to other subjects, along with the experience of their co-constitution, and our constitutive functions (such as apperception) that make such recognition possible are supported by far retention. This discovery gave us new insights into the relation of individual temporalizing consciousness and intersubjectivity.

In chapters six and seven, I added a new layer to the argument, revealing protention as the crux of a temporalizing consciousness that exceeds its own boundaries. First, the notion of the "Urimpression" is more appropriately understood as a "fulfilled protention" which is integrated into its becoming "near" retention. In fact, "fulfilled protention" better describes the function of the living present as an overlapping of its extensions, and precludes any misguided idea that one can experience the Urimpression in itself. It also supports the argument that the living present must be understood through its overlapping extensions. This discovery led to further development of the overall thesis: Because of protention, temporalizing consciousness is able to reach beyond its own borders, linking it with what is "other." Therefore, the openness of protention makes possible the extension of constitution into the realm of what is "other" to the ego, including an openness to other subjectivity. In this way, protention acts as an essential foundation to the link between the subject and intersubjectivity, and it does so both structurally and at the level of primordial experience. Protention extends consciousness beyond immediate presencing and allows for the possibility of being surprised. More specifically, protention acts as the structural support for anything new and different, including the experience of affectivity. Affectivity is not only understood as the call of objects or their absent profiles, but it can also refer to the call of the constituting activity of other subjects. Further, the affectivity of another subjective consciousness is arguably the required primordial experience of the other which is needed to describe intersubjective experiences from a phenomenological perspective. Given this, protention would act as the structural foundation for any intersubjective relation through its function of openness to what is "other," and it would also make possible the primordial experience of affectivity of the other's temporalizing consciousness that grounds this relation. Finally, protention's interrelation with retention, including passive synthesis, provides the basis for the connection with the other subject. Because I am able to link my own self-experience with the primordial affective experience of another

constituting subject, we apperceive each other as co-constituting our shared world and as living in a shared presence.

In these discussions of the different aspects of temporalizing consciousness, I also addressed the notion of empathy. An analysis of Husserl's references to empathy revealed that empathy itself can be understood to have more than one level: The first, and most well-known, level is that which I called reproductive empathy, where I re-present the other as other. The second level is based in far retention and relies also on far protention, and I called it passive-associative empathy. This sort of empathy connects me with the other subject such that I can recognize her as a subject similar to me. This empathy is also integrated with my apprehension of the other through association and appresentation. Finally, Husserl asked about a third possible level of empathy, which I called a "proto-empathy." This form of empathy is my "fusion" with the other, revealing our connection in the present immediate constitution of each other and of objects. Each of these levels of empathy show, first, the complexity of our interconnection with other subjects, and second, that this interconnection, at every level, is based in temporalizing consciousness. Thus the notion of an "intersubjective temporality" developed throughout our analyses of both temporalizing consciousness and empathy.

In chapter seven I began to consider the ramifications of these analyses, by suggesting that phenomenology might no longer base itself upon a duality between subject and object but rather upon a triad relationship of subject-object-intersubjectivity. This triangular relation "fills in the gaps," as it were, of each dual relation within it, through reference to the third member. It also reveals a way for us to understand the notion of intersubjective temporality, as this term includes the links of all three, subject, object, and intersubjectivity, implicitly. Thus in considering intersubjective temporality, we effect a transformation of the traditional phenomenological project in itself: Phenomenology must now regard some of its own discoveries, namely its intersubjective foundations, as part of its ongoing project.²⁵²

²⁵² Cf. Kelly Oliver, "The Gestation of the Other in Phenomenology," printed in *Epoché*, volume 3, numbers 1 and 2, 1995, pp. 79-116. Although Oliver's position is admittedly critical of Husserl's way of defining the ego in phenomenology, it is interesting to see that her general argument is fairly similar to ours here, that Husserl's ego is not defined solely on the basis of itself.

RECONSIDERING PHENOMENOLOGICAL QUESTIONS

The above analyses have led repeatedly to a certain paradoxical conclusion: that a phenomenological analysis of inner time-consciousness results in a recognition of intersubjective temporality. In other words, a careful examination of "my" inner time-consciousness reveals its necessary link not only with objectivity but also with intersubjectivity. At the same time, I have shown that this relation to other subjects does not destroy the individual subject but rather is part of the very structure of consciousness. It is for this reason that I have called this discovery "intersubjective temporality," in order to indicate both the individual side and the intersubjective side of this relation. "Intersubjective temporality" is meant to describe temporalizing consciousness in its true form, i.e., as linked to both objective and intersubjective horizons.

This conclusion may be quite obvious in some disciplines--for example, in psychology it is usually assumed that the individual subject is created through its relation to other subjects, and vice versa--but this is not so obvious in philosophy, and especially in a philosophy that often hearkens back to its modern foundations, i.e., to Descartes and Kant. It is for this reason that I have been working to disclose this link between subjective temporalizing consciousness and intersubjectivity on the basis of phenomenology's own assumptions. I took the different aspects of inner time-consciousness in themselves and questioned them against the relation of consciousness to its experiences of perceived objects and other subjects. By doing so, what began as a phenomenological assessment in the traditional sense, i.e., through a methodological solipsism, produced a new development in phenomenology itself: The phenomenological method revealed its own intersubjective foundations. And this arises through the important fact that, because of its temporalizing structure, individual consciousness necessarily exceeds its own borders, and it creates a bridge with the consciousness of other subjects.

But how can there be intersubjective foundations at a level where the ego itself may not be fully constituted? The level of inner time-consciousness could be understood as a pre-temporal transcendental field made up only of the flow of experiences. "I" would not exist here, nor would anyone else. An examination of this level, however, reveals not only the activities of retention and protention but also the constitution of this flow as experiences *through an individual perspective*. Thus, while my person may not be apparent at this level, the *individual* perspectives of a person are. But given this, how can the world give itself to me as having multiple perspectives at once when I only have one perspective at a time? The answer, we discovered, is twofold: First, we can only recognize multiple perspectives if consciousness is able to go

beyond the immediate moment at hand, and it does this through the active living present. Then, these other, absent profiles, we realized in chapter two, indicate perspectives that could be had by other subjects, and further, horizons of meaning not originally constituted by me. In other words, while I might be able to have other profiles as I move into them later (or earlier), the *coexistence* of unlimited absent profiles with this present one here reveals not only the transcendence of objects as perceived, but also the transcendence of their meaning. Both of these types of transcendence indicate, furthermore, the presence of objects and meanings *for others*, beyond my perspective. In addition, I see that my own consciousness is able to access these meanings, even though they exceed my own experiences. My consciousness reaches out into these horizons of intersubjective meaning.

If consciousness is interrelated with other consciousnesses, though, then what position does the living body play in this relation? Is it merely secondary to an abstract intersubjective structure, or rather, is the body fundamental to intersubjective experiences? Although I have had to set the body aside in these analyses of temporalizing consciousness, we can address it briefly with relation to Husserl's own arguments. Husserl himself argues that intersubjective experience *begins* with the appearance of the other subject. Even if the other subject is not bodily before me, I may hear her voice over the telephone, smell her perfume, feel her tiptoeing up behind me, etc. For this reason, I would challenge Sartre's position that "The Look" of the other subject is completely independent of any individual bodily presence. Instead, I suggest that there must be some originary experience of other, living subjects before one can talk of a general intersubjectivity that would affect me in the absence of any individuals. But let us consider this question in a way similar to the considerations above, by examining intersubjective structure and content. The notion of an intersubjective structure harkens back to the discussion of the indications of intersubjective meanings, recognized through the openness of consciousness to other profiles beyond the one directly before it. This structure of meaning does not depend upon the physical presence of others, and yet it implies their existence. But could it stand without any direct experience of other subjects, ever? It would seem that our openness to intersubjective horizons and meanings could only arise through some kind of direct experience of others, for the following reasons: It is only through the existence of the other subject that I know that such perspectives and horizons transcend me in the first place, because without intersubjective horizons I would only have horizons that could be based in my own position and temporalizing consciousness, giving me a very limited perspective on the world. Further, I only know the existence of the other through her body. The body of the other subject is my

only *direct* evidence of her existence at all. In fact, it is usually via the body that I am affected by her constituting consciousness. Given this and my own self-experience, I know that the body of the other is integrated with her constituting consciousness. Since the constituting consciousness of the other makes me aware of intersubjective horizons overall, and since this consciousness is integrated with a body, then we would have to say that the body of the other is required at some point in our recognition of intersubjective horizons, even if the body is not needed for *every* recognition of these horizons. The living body of the other subject, we can suggest, is not secondary to her consciousness in my apprehension of an intersubjective structure, rather, they are somewhat inter-dependent--but an in depth analysis establishing this suggestion must be left for another project.

Now we turn to a final question: If we argue that temporalizing consciousness is structurally open to intersubjectivity, how does this affect the phenomenological project as a whole? Must we now abandon the phenomenological method entirely, and thus phenomenology itself? Because phenomenology is by definition a self-critical project, a project which develops and changes according to its own effectiveness--and we see throughout Husserl's own work how this is true--then we can hardly give up phenomenology or its method because of this discovery. At the same time, however, the manifestation of individual temporalizing consciousness as having an important intersubjective aspect could lead to some adjustments in the traditional phenomenological approach. The reduction to "my" experiences must always recognize the transcendental ego's intersubjective connections as the phenomenological method strives toward its results. Furthermore, the notion of "absolute consciousness" must be taken with regard to its intersubjective underpinnings. One might argue that a solipsistic position can only be achieved at a static level of phenomenological analysis, but that at the genetic level, which underlies it, we will always discover an intersubjective connection. But these new developments hardly ruin the phenomenological project. Instead, they better prepare it for new kinds of investigations, some of which are prevalent in current philosophy. These include investigations that take up the notion of the individual subject not as an atomic "agent" but as an integrated being, both influencing and influenced, for example, in philosophical studies of race, gender, and manifestations of cultural power. Phenomenology is one of very few philosophical methods that, first, continues to develop its approach, and second, is fundamentally interested in human subjectivity and living consciousness. As such, it can address these relatively "recent" topics in philosophy quite adeptly. But it is also able to carry out Husserl's final

desired goal: a program of ethics, as a systematic philosophical approach.²⁵³ For this reason, the notion of intersubjective temporality is important not only because it has become apparent in the very foundations of the subject, but also because it is a notion that brings us closer to an analysis of ethics through revealing this foundational relation of subject and intersubjectivity. In fact, it is for these more broadly teleological reasons that this book was originally begun--and will lead to further work. But let us turn now to defining this important aspect of subjectivity understood phenomenologically.

DEFINING INTERSUBJECTIVE TEMPORALITY

Intersubjective temporality can be addressed on two now-familiar levels of temporalizing consciousness, on the levels of structure and content. But we have neither eliminated the need for subjective inner time-consciousness nor created a completely new form of temporality. Instead, we have shown that both the form and content of temporalizing consciousness reveal intersubjective links at this primordial level. With this, I have not lost my sense of self, but instead am able to understand, phenomenologically, how consciousness, which appears to be "isolated" from others, is able to apprehend the existence of other conscious beings, and to experience its world and its temporality as shared with others. Thus, intersubjective temporality gives us a way to understand the ego without isolating it in itself (an extreme version of modernism), or losing it completely to external influences and meanings (an extreme version of post-modernism).

In order to finalize our understanding of intersubjective temporality, we shall look at its structure first. The primary link to intersubjectivity lies in the structure of protention (although, of course, this is supported by retention and the living present as a whole). In order to co-constitute a world with others, consciousness must be able to reach outward toward other profiles, and toward the horizons of other meanings and consciousnesses, and it can only do this if it has a structural openness to what is other from itself. Protention makes this possible through its stretching into the future and to all that is beyond the scope of immediate consciousness. Structurally, protention is the

²⁵³ Cf. *Husserliana* XXXVII, *Husserliana* XXVII, especially pp. 20ff., and *Husserliana* VI. Cf. also Klaus Held, "Intentionalität und Existenz Erfüllung," in *Person und Sinnerfahrung: Philosophische Grundlagen und Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven*, ed. Carl Friedrich Gethmann and Peter L. Oesterreich. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993, pp. 101-116), especially pp. 111-116.

form of the living present that extends itself outward, toward the future and toward what is not yet immediately present for the ego. As such, it brings the consciousness of other subjects into the scope of its own constituting activity. It forms the bridge between my consciousness and the other's. In conjunction with this, protention supports the experience of affectivity, because protention takes consciousness beyond immediate constitution into the perspectives that are beyond my direct reach, allowing these other perspectives to attract my attention. In this way, protention makes possible the affectivity of another consciousness which calls me to constitute it as other. The bridge established by protention enables the constituting consciousness of another person to affect my own, in such a way that I am able not only to notice her, but also to notice her as another subject similar to myself. More generally, protention makes possible all appresentation and apperception, by taking consciousness beyond the presentation and perception at hand. This activity is essential in the constitution of another consciousness, both as consciousness and as other, since appresentation and apperception take what is present and indicate aspects of it beyond what is before me.

As part of the structure of intersubjective temporality, retention appears to play a somewhat subordinate role to protention, but its activities are equally essential to those of protention. Retention maintains past experiences that are part of present constitution; this includes certain past experiences which are beyond what is immediately past and yet are still somehow involved in immediate constitution, i.e., the "general memories" that assist us in constituting types of objects or patterns that we have already experienced in the past. As such, retention supports the "other side" of appresentation and apperception, taking the familiarity of a current presentation or perception, linking it to similar experiences in the past, and projecting these possibilities based on past experience into the appresentations and apperceptions. This connection between retention and the activity of appresentation and apperception has two important effects with regard to intersubjectivity: First, the retained consciousness as *my own* is linked with protention's openness to the other, so that I can appreciate both the similarity and the otherness of the other. Second, this experience of the other is itself retained, making intersubjective connection a persistent part of my constituting living present. Along with this, retention maintains my passive synthesis of myself as a consciousness involved in the world through my body, and it maintains my experiences of horizons of objects and meanings that indicate intersubjectivity. These it projects into my constitution of another subject so that I understand both her similarity to me and her otherness. Thus past

experiences of intersubjective horizons and my own self-experience are synthesized and maintained in far retention, to be integrated into my experience of any other subject. Structurally, then, retention connects the bridge maintained by protention (between my consciousness and the other's) with my experiences of myself and of intersubjective horizons. In doing so, this activity of retention, in conjunction with protention, completes the link between temporalizing consciousness and intersubjectivity.

The activity of retention also reveals the presence of intersubjective content, and so we turn here to address the level of content in intersubjective temporality. This retained content, even when taken as reduced to its pure givenness, continues to support the link between consciousness and intersubjectivity. Several types of retained content indicate intersubjective connections: the indications of intersubjective horizons that arise with the experience of transcendent objects, the experience of and reference to intersubjective meanings, the consistent experience of the now as shared, and the primordial experiences of other constituting consciousnesses as they affect my consciousness. All of these types of content, maintained by retention, assist in the present constitution of objects as well as of other subjects. They inform current experiences when they fit the type or pattern of retained intersubjective experience. In other words, retained content of prior intersubjective experience, or of typical experiences that indicate intersubjectivity, are part of the living present as retained, and they contribute to current constitution when present experience awakens this retained experience or typification. We must note that this is not a circular argument for intersubjectivity, as at the basis of all retained intersubjective content lie our primordial foundations of intersubjective experiences. These primordial foundations are our primary intersubjective experiences, through the affectivity of the other's consciousness. These affective experiences ground all experiences of other subjects, making the apperception of another consciousness possible through passive synthesis. Simply put, my originary affective experience of another consciousness is embedded in retention and, as such, it enables the "automatic" constitution of other subjects as others. Thus even the content of intersubjective experience is founded on primordial foundations and passive synthesis, all of which is maintained and made possible by a structure that both retains and is open to intersubjective horizons.

Intersubjective content on the side of protention is also important. This is the content that arrives through the affective call of the other subject's consciousness. While this content is not any direct apprehension of the other's consciousness or her own experiencing acts, it is still intersubjective in nature. The other's constituting consciousness affects me differently than

any object, or even any other sort of experience. I recognize a constitution of the world that is not my own, which de-centralizes me. This pulls me to realize that there is another constituting activity besides my own, one that shares and co-constitutes our world. This de-centralizing experience, along with the affection of the other's constituting activity itself, is the content of my experience of the other. Naturally, I cannot have the other's consciousness directly, or else she would be me. But I am affected by her consciousness along with her body, and this becomes the content for my primordial foundation of intersubjective experience. Thus, protention brings intersubjective content into the realm of retention, bringing about the primordial foundations of intersubjective experience, and in doing so, establishing the basis for the passive synthesis of intersubjective connection.

So let us address intersubjective temporality with regard to both its structure and content at once. Intersubjective temporality is the aspect of temporalizing consciousness that, structurally, reaches out for and maintains a connection between consciousness and other consciousness, and, with regard to content, indicates intersubjectivity both through retained experiences of intersubjective horizons and through affectivity. Intersubjective temporality refers to specific aspects of temporalizing consciousness as it is already understood phenomenologically, not a new type of temporality. It points to the structure of temporalizing consciousness as enabling an intersubjective link through its activity of constitution. And it points to the constituted content of consciousness, either retained or currently experienced, as indicating the co-constituting activity of multiple subjects. Thus we find the link between the temporalizing subject and intersubjectivity through recognizing the intersubjective links and indications within the phenomenological subject itself. Further, because intersubjective temporality reveals the bridge between my consciousness and that of the other, it also reveals our interdependence: The consciousness of the other must also reach out to me.

But, in order to clarify our understanding of this notion, we should perform one final analysis: my encounter of another subject as understood phenomenologically through intersubjective temporality. We can pretend, as Husserl did, that the experienced world is entirely reduced to the realm of constituted experiences, and that I take all experiences to be *without* any references to intersubjectivity. Another human body appears before me, and looks at me. In this reduced realm, I cannot assume the existence of another consciousness, but I can acknowledge, and must address, how this other body affects me. When the other subject looks at me, I feel pulled toward it, even if I take it only as a body. I am called to consider its perspective in

comparison with my own. I am pulled to feel the emotions related through its expressions. I am provoked to consider how I appear from that perspective. How does this take place? First, I can only consider a perspective or emotion other than my own on the basis of a protentional activity. Even if this is still not another subject in my eyes, I require the protentional aspect of temporalizing consciousness to exceed my position and consider another. Second, through the very activity of extending consciousness beyond its own realm, I am forced to recognize something *other* than myself, and I am open to this on the basis of protention. Third, the pull I feel, for example, when I see the pain on another's face, does not necessarily arise through a constituted similarity between that body and my own. Thus this emotive pull must have some other source than the similarity of our bodies. It is at this point that we recognize the affective pull of the other's constituting consciousness. Since I am called to feel the emotions of the other on the basis of something other than a comparison between our bodies, then something about her actual experiencing, i.e., her constituting consciousness, has affected me somehow. In other words, the criticism of Husserl's comparison of our bodies as the basis for intersubjective recognition can be taken as the launching pad for acknowledging the affectivity of the other's consciousness. If the other's body should not awaken a connection between me and her (because of the essentially different experience of my body versus of her body), then there must be some other reason that I am pulled to consider her perspective in such a specific way. The reason is found in the affectivity of her constituting consciousness. But although the emotions of the other assist us in understanding this situation, the affective call of the other's consciousness does not necessarily occur through emotion. I can be pulled by the very recognition of the other as sharing my constitution of the world, the recognition that the body over there contains an activity that takes the absoluteness of my "zero-point of orientation" away from me. I recognize a similarity between her constituting activity and my own, and constitute her as another subject similar to myself. This is made possible because of the interconnected activity of retention and protention in constituting consciousness. Retention brings my own experience of myself as active consciousness connected with this body, in passive synthesis, into my protending activity which is taking me beyond my immediate present into the horizons of the other subject. In this way, retention and protention are essential to the phenomenologically reduced experience of another subject, and they also show how this experience is made possible.

Alfred Schutz would say that this recognition of another subject forces me back into the natural attitude, that I can no longer maintain the phenomenological reduction once I acknowledge the existence of other

subjects and their effect on me.²⁵⁴ But I can make claims about intersubjective experiences without insisting on intersubjective existence, just as I analyze worldly experiences without asserting the existence of the world. These analyses have not been about intersubjective *validity* (which Schutz insists cannot be had at the phenomenologically reduced level), rather, they seek the *phenomenological foundations for intersubjective experiences*, just as Husserl sought the foundations of our experiences of transcendent objects after having bracketed out the world. According to all of the above analyses, intersubjective experiences are structurally maintained by consciousness. But here is the more radical argument: Constituting consciousness itself contains structural indications of intersubjective horizons. This we have seen through analyses of the constitution of transcendent objects, of the notion of the affectivity, of appresentation and apperception, of association, and, most basically, of protention and retention. Temporalizing consciousness maintains a structural link to intersubjectivity as part of its foundation, and in answer to the call of the other. Therefore, intersubjectivity, as Husserl indicates himself, can be seen at this primordial level of consciousness. In this way, Husserl counters Schutz's assertion (although analyses of *social* consciousness and interaction may still be limited to the natural attitude).

But let us consider this in light of our analyses of world-time. Is intersubjective temporality the same as world-time, or are they two distinct temporalizings? We have defined intersubjective temporality as the intersubjective aspect of my own temporalizing consciousness. Since it is based entirely in individual consciousness, however, it cannot be the same as world-time. World-time we defined as the synthesis of all constituting consciousnesses which together constitute a shared present. In fact, this synthetic activity makes possible our subsequent constitution of an empirical, or "clock," time. World-time, then, is not the same as intersubjective temporality, but instead, it is founded on the interconnection of all consciousness. But given our understanding of intersubjective temporality as making possible any connection to other egos, we could suggest that the interconnection of all egos in world-time would be founded in intersubjective temporality. In other words, the openness to intersubjective horizons in intersubjective temporality is the ground for our co-constitution of the world with other subjects, and this co-constitution includes the synthetic

²⁵⁴ Alfred Schutz, "The Problem of Transcendental Intersubjectivity in Husserl," trans. Frederick Kersten. *Collected Papers, III, Studies in Phenomenological Philosophy*, ed. I. Schutz. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, The Hague, The Netherlands, 1966, pp. 51-84.

constitution of a world-time by all subjects. World-time, therefore, is supported by intersubjective temporality.

We have clearly taken Husserl beyond his own realm: We filled out his descriptions of "near" and "far" retention, even considered the possibility of a "near" and "far" protention. We took his references to a "world-time" and pushed them to their limits, and we constructed the notion of "intersubjective temporality" in order to name the link between temporalizing consciousness and other subjective consciousness that is regularly indicated in Husserl's own writings. But these analyses have been supported by references to Husserl's work, taking up his direct claims, and some of his hints, with regard to the need to find the foundation for intersubjective experience. As a final note, I would like to point to a couple remaining citations that show Husserl's explicit interest in the relation between temporalizing consciousness and intersubjectivity:

Now I experience the other, and naturally I have self-experience of myself. I find that *"in my now I experience the other" and his now*; I find *my and his now as existing in one*, my appearances and his, that which is appearing for me as valid and his, but both as the same.²⁵⁵

In another passage, we see even more clearly how Husserl intends the subject to be understood as integrated with other subjects:

What I am now does not arise from my past and my therein respective directedness toward futural becoming, but rather, in my respective present I take up the being of the other due to an importance which grows in him, which now keeps working in me because it belongs to me—and then it works into the others, and this process continues.²⁵⁶

In both passages, we see how Husserl was tending toward an analysis of the relation of temporalizing consciousness and intersubjectivity. We also see

²⁵⁵ "Ich erfahre nun den Anderen und habe von mir natürlich Selbsterfahrung. Ich finde das 'in meinem Jetzt erfahre ich den Anderen' und sein Jetzt; ich finde als in eins seiend mein und sein Jetzt, meine Erscheinungen und seine, mein Erscheinendes als mir Geltendes und seines, aber beides als dasselbe." *Husserliana XV*, p. 332. My emphasis and translation.

²⁵⁶ "Was ich jetzt bin, erwächst nicht aus meiner Vergangenheit und meiner darin jeweiligen Gerichtetheit auf künftiges Werden, sondern in meiner jeweiligen Gegenwart nehme ich das Sein des Anderen hinsichtlich gewisser seiner in ihm erwachsenen Geltungen mit auf, die nun als die mir zugeeigneten in mir fortwirken--dann hineinwirken in die Anderen, und so beständig." *Husserliana XV*, p. 603. My translation.

that he was indicating a necessary link between these two levels of phenomenological study, a link which is essential to a phenomenological understanding of the world. Husserl never carried out an extensive analysis which sought the foundations of these experiences, but the relationship between temporalizing consciousness and intersubjectivity was clearly important to him. Intersubjective temporality might answer some of the challenges he faced, and our descriptions of the intersubjective aspect of inner time-consciousness grounds the link between constituting consciousness and intersubjectivity to which Husserl was pointing.

I have intended here to link Husserl's notion of the temporalizing subject with an intersubjective structure by establishing an understanding of intersubjective temporality. This will further enable productive discussion between philosophical analyses which focus on the subject and those which examine intersubjective relations. The notion of intersubjective temporality has pushed the limits of phenomenology on the basis of its own assumptions, showing that phenomenology is fully capable of being both a philosophy of subjectivity and one of intersubjectivity.

CONCLUSION

I have analyzed Husserl's theory of inner time-consciousness at every level, taking up each aspect for itself and examining Husserl's discussions from early to late writings. I looked at the Urimpression and the living present, then retention, and finally protention. Each of these aspects of constituting consciousness was established for itself, and then considered in light of intersubjectivity and our co-constitution of the world. Executing my own analyses in many cases, but basing them on Husserl's own writings, I argued that this foundational level of consciousness, which constitutes temporality, the ego, and all of our experiences, is necessarily linked with intersubjective horizons and consciousness. I called this aspect of consciousness "intersubjective temporality."

Intersubjective temporality maintains my own self-experience alongside my experiences of intersubjective horizons, and it projects beyond my presencing of consciousness toward other consciousnesses in my experience. It enables my fluid constitution of other subjects, and my experience of the world as shared, co-constituted, and mutually experienced in one temporality called world-time. It does not cause my own ego to self-destruct, nor does it disable my ability to reflect or carry out the phenomenological reduction. Instead, intersubjective temporality explains phenomenologically most of my experiences of the world and any experiences of other subjects.

The notion of intersubjective temporality led me to consider intersubjectivity as included in the foundations of phenomenology. Thus there would be a three-part foundational structure, subject-object-intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity is the structure that enables the experience of transcendent objects such that they appear to have an infinite number of intersubjectively accessible possible profiles. Conversely, these profiles indicate this intersubjective structure. Intersubjectivity also makes up part of the foundation of the subject itself, as intersubjective horizons are embedded in and indicated by the experiencing subject. Naturally, the subject indicates intersubjectivity as well. And, of course, the relation between subject and object has already been well established in phenomenology. For these reasons, intersubjectivity seems to be a necessary leg in the foundations of phenomenological study, without trivializing the importance of the other two. But how this new understanding of phenomenology will affect it as a discipline has yet to be seen. It could be that the foundations of phenomenology will hardly be shaken by these conclusions, since its method and its primary conclusions still stand as essential to its program. But perhaps, given the preceding analysis of the foundations of consciousness and my description of intersubjective temporality, our approach to

phenomenological investigation will now include a new perspective. In any case, it is hoped that the analyses carried out here, and their conclusion in the notion of intersubjective temporality, are worthy of consideration by phenomenologists who take the questions of temporalizing consciousness and intersubjectivity seriously.