



Gerhard Preyer

Goethe-University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

ORCID: 0000-0002-1410-686

e-mail: preyer@em.uni-frankfurt.de

New Outline of the Philosophy of the Mental A Sketch

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/RF.2019.026>

*Ce qu'on peut nommer proprement subjectivité,
c'est la conscience (de) conscience.*

Jean-Paul Sartre¹

1. Take Off From the Initial Situation

1. *Reinterpretation.* The *initial situation* of the philosophy of the mental since the 1950s years leads to a new research program about how there is linked together the realm of mind, or the mental, with language, communication (the social), and the rest of nature.² The flood of projects of

¹ Jean-Paul Sartre, *L'être et le néant* (Paris: Gallimard, 1943), 29.

² Gerhard Preyer, "On Contemporary Philosophy of Mind. From the 1950s Years to the Present", *Ruch Filozoficzny* 71, no. 4 (2015): 7–27; idem, "Zur gegenwärtigen Philosophie des Mentalen", in: Wolfgang Röd, Wilhelm K. Essler, *Geschichte der Philosophie Bd. 14: Die Philosophie der neuesten Zeit Hermeneutik, Frankfurter Schule, Strukturalismus, Analytische Philosophie Autoren: Wolfgang Röd, Wilhelm Essler, Julian Nida-Rümelin, Gerhard Preyer* (München: Beck Verlag, 2019), forthcoming. A new turn linking mental, language, and social is done by the Insensitive Semantics: Herman Cappelen, Ernie Lepore, *Insensitive Sensitive Semantics. A Defense of Semantic Minimalism and Speech Act Pluralism* (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), on further researches, e.g.: *Beyond Semantics and Pragmatics*, ed. Gerhard Preyer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018). The designation of the domain of theorizing is usually named "mind", but mental is a broader designation of theorizing and researches. "Mind" designates

the versions of naturalized epistemology borders on the phenomenal consciousness, intentionality, and the elementary or what I shall later call *primary, non-reflective, non-intentional* self-consciousness of all conscious mental states as well.³ In this theoretical situation phenomenology, Sartre's pre-reflectivity, and self-consciousness have won a new attention. One consequence was a focussing on the concept of representation (perception) as a main feature of the mental and consciousness. In the meantime, we recognize two streams in the philosophy of the mental and epistemology: representationalism and anti-representationalism (individualism and anti-individualism), which are focussed on the problem of objectivity and communication along the Frege-argument, the private and the public language, holism, and anti-holism. We can reinterpret the changed situation thereby whether objectivity does have a subjective starting point or not? From Husserl's view is this the question about the "primordial" phenomenological components of experience and the sub-propositional constitution of the mental.

Firstly, it is concluded from main subjects of contemporary philosophy of the mental the research program of the analysis of the internal framework of the mental. Secondly, it is sketched the internal framework along the structure of immunity. The structure is self-determined by the unmediated consciousness and its dissection by time. In the theoretical situation of the debate between internalism and externalism in the philosophy of the mental and language we have thereby a mediation between both accounts. The leading problem is the self-binding of mental states and finding the place of mental in nature. But this place leads us to the existence-consciousness, and the conclusion that we are not a part of nature in the naturalized metaphysics view. This is a limitation of physicalism (materialism).

2. *Self-referential structure of consciousness.* There is a near consensus among philosophers about what is to be analyzed in the philosophy of the mental:

1. Consciousness is a *consciousness of something*, that is, it is directed to something (intentionality). The consciousness brings about this entity to which it is directed in an objective relationship to itself. The question is: what is the relation between intentionality as a representation of conditions of fulfilment, language, and world?

an intellectual conceptual analysis only, e.g. definitions, conceptual classification, and formalizations.

³ Tyler Burge, "16 Mind-Body Causation and Explanatory Practice", in: Tyler Burge, *Foundation of Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 360.

Searle's view is that intrinsic intentionality as a property of the brain is prior to language, but our cognitive apparatus is determined by language. Other questions are: Does it have intentionality a phenomenal component? Has the phenomenal consciousness an intentional content, e.g., Tye (in his Panic-Theory) and Dretske have argued?⁴

2. The intentional propositional content is distinct from the *consciousness itself*. The former is what we focus on by sentences expressing propositional attitudes. Intentional consciousness is a consciousness about something outside of intentional consciousness, that is, the content has a fulfillment condition and an external reference. The question is how do we take hold of the intentional propositional content? This was Frege's problem of *Sinn*.

3. Every conscious state has a *phenomenal component*. It is a phenomenon of itself, that is, a subjective/phenomenal experience (*Erlebnis*) as a mental state: we are familiar with ourselves (self-presentation). *Erlebnisse* (usually translated as "experiences") are not given as objects, that is, we do not hear, see, or feel them like the objects of experience, or that of which we are aware. This is the intransitive feature of phenomenal experience.⁵ Lived experiences (*E*) are not only non-cognitive "mental states" or happenings toward something, e.g., grief, admiration, and trouble, but also sensations, that is, *E* is the quality that we are familiar/conscious with ourselves unmediately/phenomenally and this is an intrinsic feature of consciousness, and may not be confined merely to raw feels.⁶ Lived experiences are fulfilled by themselves. They are self-

⁴ Michael Tye, *Consciousness, Color, and Content* (Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 2000). The Panic-Theory is: phenomenal character of experience is one and the same, that is: poised, abstract, non-conceptual, and has an intentional content. The problem reference is the external individuation of the intentional content of the content of the phenomenal consciousness.

⁵ About the ambiguity of the expression "Erlebnis", Manfred Frank, "Besteht Selbstbewusstsein in einem 'inneren Wahrnehmen'?", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität* (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2012), 326–278. One may distinguish with Husserl three sorts of consciousness: 1. intentional acts, 2. non-intentional sensations, and emotions, which are not components of intentional consciousness, and 3. a mental "Erlebnis", i.e., an "inner awareness", which is an intentional act of a prior act. The question is that Husserl describes the inner awareness as a sort of intentionality. But it is to mention being fair that Husserl also considered a non-intentional sense of *Erlebnis* as presupposed "inner awareness" is directed. But he does not take that into account systematically enough. *Erlebnis* is not translated fine grained enough with "subjective/phenomenal experience". Perhaps "lived experience" is a better English expression. In this text I used "Erlebnis = lived experience *E*".

⁶ See in particular, Franz von Kutschera, "Unsere Schwierigkeiten mit dem Geistigen", *Erkenntnis* 28, no. 2–3 (1998): 171–182; idem, *Jenseits des Materialismus* (Paderborn: Mentis, 2003); ibidem, *Philosophie des Geistes* (Paderborn: Mentis, 2009). American colleagues, e.g. T. Horgan and S. Nichols, agree that "...experiential self-presence is an immediate – i.e., unmediated – involvement of the self in consciousness,

fulfilling happenings, and they fix the distinctive feature of the mental.⁷ Lived experience (*E*) is a monadic happening. As such conscious states cannot be displaced elsewhere beyond oneself. Therefore it is not possible for others to have our lived experiences (*E*) but lived experiences can be shared by doing something together with others. That is, *Leiber* can communicate and causally interact.

The question is “How do we become aware of lived experiences (*E*)?”. The answer was by inner awareness. Husserl has called the knowledge of inner awareness “adequate evidence” (Brentano: secondary object), which is to distinguish from the external awareness that has an “inadequate evidence” (transcendence, Brentano: primary object). Looking back to Husserl the differentiation of the structure of immunity by the distinction between an *adequate*, an *inadequate evidence*, and *certainty* is fruitful with some modifications.⁸ Evidence is not knowledge which is propositional. The propositional knowledge can be false. This is a correction of Plato’s view on knowledge as truth without any error. The adequate evidence of mental states is of something, of which one is already conscious prior to reflection. In regard to these there is no distinct subject and object of conscious mental states. We may call these the unmediated and private lived experiences (*E*).⁹

This position enables articulation of the *adequacy of ways of immunity* of the self-referential structure of consciousness. We may follow Sartre’s *pour soi* regarding this structure of the empty form of consciousness. This

as opposed to mediated involvement via the conscious representation of self” (T. Horgan, S. Nichols, “The Zero Point and I”, in: *Pre-reflective consciousness. Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Sofia Miguens, Clara Bravo, Gerhard Preyer (Abingdon–New York: Routledge, 2016): 146).

⁷ Franz von Kutschera, *Philosophie des Geistes* (Paderborn: Mentis, 2009), 31–32, Konrad Cramer, “‘Erlebnis’ Thesen zu Hegels Theorie des Selbstbewusstseins mit Rücksicht auf die Aporien eines Grundbegriffs nachhegelscher Philosophie”, in: *Stuttgarter Hegel-Tage 1970*, ed. Hans-Georg Gadamer (Hamburg: Mainer 2016), second edition, 537–603. The turn is inspired by his father Wolfgang Cramer, *Die Monade* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1954). He has argued intentionality presupposes lived experience *E* as structure = self-reference, relation to myself – broad meaning of reflection (*ibidem*, 59, 60).

⁸ Edmund Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen 2 Vol. Unveränderte Nachdruck der 2. umgearbeiteten Auflage von 1913* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1980), sixth edition, V, § 5. Husserl makes the distinction between apodictic evidence, that is, the mental component as evidential awareness, which cannot be otherwise, assertive view of a thing individual or individual state of affairs, and between adequate evidence without grades, and inadequate evidence, where the thing is present in profiles or perspectives.

⁹ On the problem of evidence in epistemology and metaphysics, see e.g., Wolfgang Stegmüller, *Metaphysik, Wissenschaft, Skepsis* (Wien: Springer, 1954), 96–151; Franz von Kutschera, *Grundfragen der Erkenntnistheorie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981), 36–42.

enables us to make the distinction between the timeless pre-reflectivity of consciousness, and the temporal implementation of the mental. This goes along with Sartre's analysis of pre-reflectivity and his analysis of the consciousness of time. But in contrast to Husserl evidence is a primitive pre-reflectivity and not an intellectual view of state of affairs (*Sachverhalt*). It is an unmediated evidence of self-consciousness, and is not an inner awareness (Brentano) or a knowledge. The adequate evidence (consciousness) is self-given as the self-transparency of mental states. Therefore consciousness cannot be an object we refer to from a third person attitude.

4. Consciousness is *unified*, that is, there is an unity of all conscious states as the "ubiquity of self-awareness", that is, the jointless unity of consciousness as being-conscious or pre-reflective self-familiarity and not the manifold of *which* one is conscious.

5. Consciousness has to do with the ontological subject because just this is ineluctable and the prior condition for all acts of manifestation and self-manifestation. It is to recommended to make the distinction between both: the ontological and epistemological objectivity and subjectivity.¹⁰

6. The self-knowledge as *I-knowledge*. The lived experience (*E*) in "3". is to distinguish from "1". the intentional consciousness and "2". the intentional content. Self-knowledge is based in a non-thetic or pre-reflective consciousness. This is Sartre's view.¹¹ Self-knowledge is not a "shift of attention" from a non-conceptual self-consciousness (Damasio: sense of self¹²).

3. *Consequence*. The critical issues are "2". the intentional content, "3". the phenomenal component, and "4". the ubiquity of self-awareness because clarification of these fixes the role of the unmediated consciousness as self-determination of the mental. Key, however, is the structure of consciousness as the ubiquity of self-awareness, its jointless unity, and its dissection. Frank and Zahavi¹³ therefore conclude correctly that

1. a theoretical turn is required, which does not analyse the mental states of a subject M that are conscious or represented by the further

¹⁰ John R. Searle, *Making the Social World. The Structure of Human Civilization* (Oxford–New York: 2010), 17–18.

¹¹ The pre-reflective consciousness is also accepted in his critique on the Higher Order Theory from Laurence Bonjour, "Toward a Defense of Empirical Foundationalism", in: *Resurrecting Old-Fashioned Foundationalism*, ed. Michael R. DePaul (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 21–38.

¹² Antonio R. Damasio, *Self Comes to Mind. Constructing the Conscious Brain* (New York: Random House, 2010).

¹³ Dan Zahavi, *Subjectivity and Selfhood. Investigating the First-Person Perspective* (Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 2005).

mental state of the subject *M'* with the reflective-pronominal use of language – this is called the “two states” view¹⁴ –, but by a *jointless unity* of consciousness (ubiquity of self-awareness) and its *differentiation*.¹⁵ At this theoretical place is also to classify Michel Henry because he argues that all “manifestation is (pre-reflective, the author) self-manifestation” and is no reference of intentionality as the basic feature of mental states.¹⁶

Call that the question of the so-called *structure* of consciousness as an *internal framework of the mental*, which is constituted by the ubiquity of self-consciousness, that is, its jointless unity and its differentiation,¹⁷ and the problem of binding of mental states (structure). The varieties of self-conscious builds the structure as a differentiations of the fulfilment conditions of conscious states. This turn is motivated from Castañeda’s Guise-theory, which is also intended as such framework. The question is: is a mental event, which happens to a subject or is self-ascribed by I-myself, to be interpreted as a self-representation or a reflection of something? Is self-consciousness a case of a consciousness of something?

2. The issue “5”. – the ontological subjectivity of consciousness – leads us to renew and to a reinterpretation of the Cartesian/Husserl view of the *self-determination* of the mental as a redrawing of the distinction between of the internal (mental), and the external (reality) from the subject’s point of view. Therefore it is valid in a well understand meaning: “No object without a subject, and no subject without an object” (Fichte).

¹⁴ Joseph Levine, “Review Uriah. Kriegel, *Subjective Consciousness* 2009”, *Philosophical Reviews* (2010), 1–11, see 7.

¹⁵ On the exposition of this problem in the philosophy of the mental: Manfred Frank, “7. Lässt sich Selbstbewusstsein als ‘Selbstrepräsentation verstehen?’”, in: idem, *Ansichten der Subjektivität* (Berlin, Suhrkamp, 2012), 371–374.

¹⁶ Michel Henry, *L’Essence de la manifestation* (1963), English version: *The Essence of Manifestation* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff/Brill, 1973), 47 seq. This is mentioned from James Hart, “Introduction: Castañeda, A Continental Philosophical Guise”, in: Hector-Neri Castañeda, *The Phenomeno-Logic of the I: Essays on Self-Consciousness*, ed. James G. Hart, Tomis Kapitan (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 29: “In France, Michel Henry has attempted to show in countless ways what he calls the “monist” prejudice of most philosophy, i.e., that manifestation, appearing, etc. requires intentionality or reference. This blinds philosophers to the non-reflexive, non-intentional form in which consciousness is always self-consciousness. Without a self-presence of that dative of manifestation to which what appears appears, the genitive of manifestation, the appearances of ..., could not happen. In this sense all manifestation is self-manifestation”.

¹⁷ On the unity of consciousness compare, e.g., David Chalmers, *The Character of Consciousness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 497–539. It is informative that he argues: “In nature it may be that the most basic sort of conscious state is the total phenomenal state, the phenomenal field, or even the phenomenal world. These total states are basic, but they are not featureless” (ibidem, 538–539). Call that the problem of binding of mental states structure.

3. The main question in the theory of consciousness is like Henrich and Frank have argued from Fichte's *original insight*, that the philosophy of reflection of Cartesian epistemology, or the assumption that consciousness is to characterize by an inner reflection involves a vicious circle: to know oneself as oneself presupposes a prior self-knowing or it requires an infinite regress of further acts of self-reflection, assuming that every conscious state is an object of another conscious state.¹⁸ Block, e.g., has argued that there is no circle free analysis of consciousness. Husserl is also to mention in this context because he has argued that there is a circle of reflection and a regress of inner awareness of the consciousness of time, which he claimed to break. Reflection can only find something what is already assumed, and the absolute time-flow is differentiated by phases of intentional lived experiences (*E*).¹⁹ This problem is quite independent and untouched by the typical formulation of issues of rationalism and empiricism have occurred in modern epistemology.

¹⁸ Dieter Henrich, *Fichtes ursprüngliche Einsicht* (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1967), firstly published in *Subjektivität und Metaphysik*. Festschrift für Wolfgang Cramer, ed. Dieter Henrich, Hans Wagner (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1966), 188–233; English version: "Fichte's Original Insight", in: *Contemporary German Philosophy*, vol. 1, ed. Darrel E. Christensen (University Park-London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1982), 15–53. Manfred Frank, "2. Wovon ist Selbstbewusstsein ein Bewusstsein?", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 75. On the extensive and intensive regress: Kenneth Williford, "The Self-Representational Structure of Consciousness", in: *Self-Representational Approaches to Consciousness*, ed. Kriegel, Williford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 111–142; idem, "Zahavi and Brentano: A Rejoinder", *Psyche* 12, no. 2 (2006); on the "paradoxes of subjectivity", Kenneth Williford, David Rudrauf, Gregory Landini, "The Paradoxes of Subjectivity and the Projective Structure of Consciousness", in: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*, ed. S. Miguens, G. Preyer, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 321–336; Dan Zahavi, "The Heidelberg School and the Limits of Reflection", in: *Consciousness: From Perception to Reflection in the History of Philosophy*, ed. Sara Heinamaa, Vili Lähteenmäki, Paulina Remes (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), 267–285, James Hart, "From Metafact to Metaphysics in the Heidelberg School", *ProtoSociology* 36 (2019): *Senses of Self. Approaches to Pre-Reflective Self-Consciousness*, ed. Marc Borner, Manfred Frank, and Kenneth Williford, forthcoming, Gerhard Preyer, "The Problem of Subjectivity: Dieter Henrich's Turn", in: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*, 189–211.

¹⁹ Manfred Frank, "From 'Fichte's Original Insight' to a Moderate Defence of Self-Representationalism", *ProtoSociology* 36 (2019). He emphasizes "What reflection finds appears to have *already been there before*" Novalis, (Friedrich von Hardenberg), *Schriften. Zweiter und Dritter Band*, In: *Das philosophische Werk I und II*, eds. Richard Samuel, Hans-Joachim Mähl, Gerhard Schulz, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1965/1968.

2. The Internal Framework and the Structure of Immunity

(a) Problem Reference

1. *The structure of consciousness.* The subject of the philosophy of the mental is the structure of consciousness as a variation of its self-reference (subjectivity) by the consciousness without joints (as discussed by Frank and Kriegel with regard to varieties of self-consciousness²⁰). This analysis has to fulfil the *de se* constraint. The proposal here is that the structure of consciousness, as a jointless unity, is articulated by the what we may call "A New Outline". This brings to light the internal framework of the mental in terms of the issues self-consciousness, phenomenal consciousness, I-knowledge, intentional consciousness, the consciousness of time, and the existence-consciousness. With the New Outline we redraw the internal-external distinction in the philosophy of the mental. You may call it the frame-work of subjectivity.

2. *Immunity, adequate, inadequate evidence, and certainty.* Along the issues of the New Outline we find the *structure of immunity*. Shoemaker has argued "my use of the word "I" as a subject of such statements as that I feel pain, or see a canary is not due to my having identified as myself something". This means there is no "awareness of one self as an object to play in explaining my introspective knowledge" of those states. This means for Shoemaker that self-reference does not imply self-identification. This is a precondition for the ascription of mental, and body predicates. The reference to body states is from this point of view a secondary reference. The ascription of body predicates is dependent on the mental self-reference. Shoemaker argues for an immunity from error of self-reference, and this excludes also error through misidentification.²¹ The question is: how strong is the immunity? Have we to assume that the immunity, and the self-evidence of mental states are unaffected by radical changes in one's contextual horizontal background?²²

²⁰ Frank, "Varieties of Subjectivity", in: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*, 171–187.

²¹ Sydney Shoemaker, *Self-Knowledge and Self-Identity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963); idem, "Self-Reference and Self-Awareness", in: idem, *Identity, Cause and Mind: Philosophical Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 6–18; idem, "Self-Knowledge and Inner Sense", in: *First Person Perspective and other Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 201–268.

²² The question was dramatized by Daniel C. Dennett's Multiple Draft model as a critique on the Cartesian Theatre model G. Ryle. His view is that the heterophenomenological method bridging the asymmetry between the first and third person attitude and consciousness. The method is neutral about the first person

Answering the question regarding the strength of immunity by means of the distinction between an *adequate*, an *inadequate evidence*, and *certainty* is fruitful.²³ The adequate evidence is self-fulfilled by itself. The inadequate evidence is the domain of cognition, that is, memory, belief, and error. This evidence is incomplete because we recognise the external reality only by way of cross reference (*Verweisen*). Certainty strictly speaking is not to be found in what is given inadequately; doubt and scepticism are always possible. The problem of certainty and error goes along with the self-limitation of scepticisms. The fulfilment condition of inadequate evidence goes beyond the adequate evidence.

The unmediated consciousness as familiar with our-selves (myself) is at the of necessity self-evident. Thereby it is immune to error. Unmediated self-consciousness is not a propositional knowledge, which is true or false; nor is it conceptual knowledge. The adequate evidence is an intuition. Intuition as self-evidence of oneself is not a mystical state, and we do not make an anti-scientific turn because the mental is ontological subjective. Of course there are intuitions which are pre-theoretical; and the concepts may be languid and our assigning of appropriate extensions in error, as may be the proper relationship of (Fregean) sense and reference. But this is all quite different from the “intuitions” of self-awareness and references to oneself as oneself.

The self-evidence is not the epistemic certainty of the Cartesian ego cogito axiom, if we take the *sum* to be a matter of inference from the *cogito*. A mental state, a cogito, is conscious by itself pre-reflectively, which eo ipso makes one certainly and apodictically conscious of one self as being in such state (the certain evidence of the ubiquity of self-reference, i.e., one’s being pre-reflectively self-aware). The modes of evidence gives the unmediated consciousness and thereby the unity of consciousness the direction of its preservation over time. The structure of consciousness as an unity is differentiated by the self-given-modes of the unmediated consciousness, which is self-fulfilled by itself.

description of my own mental state, and about third person ascriptions to a second person. He calls his view first person operationalism. On Dennett: Sophia Miguens, *Uma Teoria Fisicalista do Conteúdo e da Consciência-Dennett e os debates da filosofia da mente* (Porto: Campo da Letras, 2001) rep.: *ProtoSociology. On Contemporary Philosophy* (www.protosociology.de); David Rosenthal, *Consciousness and Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). He cuts off Shoemakers strong immunity by a “week immunity” (ibidem, 353–360); Rosenthal’s view is: consciousness is not an intrinsic property of conscious states in general.

²³ Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen*, vol. 2, V, § 5.

(b) Self-Consciousness as an Unmediated Consciousness

1. *Unmediated consciousness and pour soi.* Let us call the unmediated and non-conceptual consciousness *self-consciousness* (primary consciousness). By being conscious we are familiar with ourselves unmediately; this is a form (structure) of consciousness. The unmediated consciousness is non-conceptual and self-presenting, that is, we are conscious in a non-mediate, intuitive way and this consciousness is ubiquitous. Getting clear on this allows a continuation of the early Sartre's analysis of the *pour soi*. The unmediated consciousness is pre-reflective, but its foundation is not the apodictic (epistemic) certainty of the *cogito sum*²⁴ which may be envisioned either as reflection on what is given adequately ("cogito") or as an intuitive inference: if I am thinking I must be. It is self-transparent and not beclouded by anything, but thereby there is a *néant d'être*. It is an (self-) evident consciousness as familiar with itself²⁵ and not a view (inner awareness).

When we begin with the assumption that there is consciousness, and this consciousness is conscious by its-self as an intuition we have then there is no circle or regress in the theory of consciousness because consciousness presupposes a primary self-consciousness. In this context it is worth mentioning Shoemaker who has argued: "Perceptual self-knowledge presupposes non-perceptual self-knowledge, so not all self-knowledge can be perceptual".²⁶ Again this states that the unmediated consciousness is not self-represented or self-interpretation. It is not any representation or interpretation of something. This is the original insight of Fichte's philosophy (Henrich).

2. *Accessibility constraint.* By eliminating the circle and regress in the philosophy of consciousness we introduce the constitutive condition of the primary self-consciousness: *Mental states are conscious (subjective) in the sense that we have an unmediated (pre-reflective) consciousness (conscious lived experience (E)).*

²⁴ Pre-reflective self-consciousness is emphasized by Edmund Husserl, Aron Gurwitsch, Michael Henry, Jean-Paul Sartre, Alvin Goldman, Manfred Frank. Self-reference is not paradoxally. It is as such not to objectify. Laurence Bonjour, "The Dialectic of Foundationalism and Coherentism", in: *The Blackwell Guide to Epistemology*, ed. Jonathan Greco, Ernest Sosa, Matthias Steup (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), second edition. He accepts an infallible no-apperceptive consciousness of a content, which is constitutive for the reflective belief (ibidem, 131).

²⁵ Sartre, *L'être et le néant*, 28, 29, 52, 57; Manfred Frank, "3. Zeit und Selbst Oder: Wie sich präreflexives Bewusstsein differenziert", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 244.

²⁶ Sydney Shoemaker, "A Materialist's Account," in: Sydney Shoemaker, Richard Swinburn, *Personal Identity*, Series: Great Debates on Philosophy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 105.

This is the *accessibility constraint* of being in a mental state as a subject, that is, we have a proper access which is the lived experience and not anything like an internal perception by which we come at ourselves from without. In truth we can only access ourselves in this way from within. This restraint may be labelled as the architecture of a “structural internalism”.

The condition tells us a way we are conscious of mental states when these states are conscious. When we accept this condition then we agree with the assumption that states being conscious cohere that one’s being in some mental states thereby these states are familiar with themselves “anonymously” as an unmediated acquaintance. But this does not mean that there is no owner or the “I” is a higher level construction (Russell). The *what* of the primary self-consciousness is non-conceptual and it is not presented by an object, but it is conscious pre-reflectively. The *how* of the primary self-consciousness is its self-presentation as an intrinsic feature of all mental states.²⁷

The unmediated consciousness, which I have, is not – in contrary to David Lewis and Chisholm – a property. The self-consciousness is *immediate*, therefore there is no space for error. It is not constituted by an ascription of an intentional act or intentional relationship, no space-temporal entity, and no I-knowledge. We are familiar with it by an unmediated acquaintance. Self-consciousness is a particular type of being. It is pre-reflective (non-conceptual), a non-relational (non-reflective), and an anonymous consciousness.²⁸

3. *Internalistic self-evidence*. As an “anonymous” unmediated consciousness one has the *self-evidence* of itself by itself along with its ubiquity, and self-transparency. It is a pre-reflective *self-evidence* as self-preservative (*selbstbewahrend*), and we have no doubt about that. It is the unity of consciousness as familiar with one’s own mental states. I cannot have pain without feeling pain, or I cannot, e.g., see, think, deliberate, intent, or remember without I am conscious about these states. The meaning of mental state as conscious as such is different from psycho-physical predications, e.g., how old I am, what is my weight, or the health of my body. Mental states are self-evident independently from the classification by predicates. This is a limitation of global scepticism. The structure

²⁷ This does not exclude unconscious mental states. This is not the subject of the study. But this states are not to conceptualize as an unconsciousness Sigmund Freud. On critique on Freud’s unconsciousness Brentano, Husserl, Sartre, Jacques Lacan, Alasdair C. McIntyre, and Searle.

²⁸ This is also accepted from Kenneth Williford, David Rudrauf, Gregory Landini, “Paradoxes of Subjectivity and the Projective Structure of Consciousness”, in: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*, 324–326.

of this internalistic self-evidence is consubstantiated along all mental states without indexicality. Castañeda argues that there is no qualitative identical empirical I in the history of the empirical self, but a sameness relation (transubstantiation) of ephemeral I-Guises.²⁹

One must distinguish pre-reflective *self-evidence* from *simple evidence*. This evidence is also obvious by itself, e.g., logical truth. But it is at the same time not immune by inaccurate intuitions, like, e.g., false conclusions. The self-evidence of self-awareness is not reliability and truthfulness standing in contrast to perceptual falsity, or an empirical evidence, which we express in observation sentences; it is not a feeling, not a knowledge about myself; not a propositional knowledge. It is a non-intentional evident consciousness of itself.³⁰ It is the *open field* of consciousness (Gurwitsch).³¹ Or in other words: it is self-fulfilled by itself as a self-presentation of consciousness in every moment.

It is to emphasize that the unmediated consciousness is connected with the consciousness of time directly because in the unshiftable *now-point* time consciousness is conscious as such in a flash without any mediation. The problem is that the unmediated consciousness of the presence of now-point time and consciousness of a succession of time are not the same. The riddle is that the being of the now-point is always shifting (riddle of the unity and difference between *nunc stans* and *nunc fluens*; Husserl: problem of *Ur-Impression/living presence*). The unmediated consciousness is differentiated by time, and is at the same time pre-reflective conscious in every *ecstatic* being.³² This is the connection between world time as continuum and its differentiation by the time-sequences instantiated to clock pulse events of an impulse generator because we cannot

²⁹ Hector-Neri Castañeda, "The Self and the I – Guises, Empirical and Transcendental", in: *I-Structures and the Reflexivity of Self-Consciousness*, 264. In *The Phenomenology of the 'I'. Essays on Self-Consciousness*, ed. James G. Hart, Tomis Kapitan (Bloomington–Indianapolis: Indiana Press, 1999), he makes the distinction between: "identity and consubstantiation, and between genuinely identical and distinct individual guises that are in some respect the same" (ibidem, 185); "Each I or I-guise is the ephemeral proprietary subject of an experience, be this perceptual or purely intellectual, be it reflective or actional, and it is demarcated by the here and the now of the experience. Of course, each I is existentially the same as, or consubstantiated with, other individual guises; some of these are physical, some are psychological, and some are agents constituted by social roles, by duties and interdictions" (ibidem, 200). On a theory of sameness family of relations: idem, "Thinking and the Structure of the World", *Philosophia* 4 (1974): 4–40; idem, "Identity and Sameness", *Philosophia* 5 (1975): 121–150. The general account requires a detailed analysis.

³⁰ Frank, "6. Varietäten der Subjektivität", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 363–364.

³¹ Aron Gurwitsch, *Das Bewusstseinsfeld* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975).

³² Frank, "3. Zeit und Selbst Oder: Wie sich präreflexives Bewusstsein differenziert", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*. With respect to Husserl, Brentano, and Sartre's turn in the analysis to the consciousness of time, see ibidem, 226–227.

dispose about an undifferentiated continuum, and the consciousness of time.

(c) Phenomenal Consciousness

1. *Statement of identity.* Phenomenal states are a problem child for every version of the naturalized epistemology since Nagel's "What is it like to be a Bat?" (1974) (Horgan, Nichols: phenomenal subjectivity).³³ This subjectivity is a "non-representational self-presence". It is often argued that phenomenal properties have no causal power because there is a supervenience upon physical states. Some authors has argued that supervenient states go not along with causal relations, and causal power is established on a lower level of explanations (Fodor, Lepore and Loewer³⁴).

To get at the issue consider, e.g., that "Water is H₂O" is not an analytic truth, but a law. We may be read "water" also as spring of life. The error is the switch from a bi-conditional to a statement of identity. A statement of identity presupposes the same properties, but pain has a phenomenal content with which we are familiar directly. We do not ascribe neural states this property. Moreover there are no contingent identities between objects and properties, but there are contingent statements about these properties. We may assume brain events and experiences to both belong to persons and assume an interchangeability of property ascription, e.g., that this damaged nerve is a pain, or this pain in the stomach is a lesion in a gall bladder, and thus there may be local supervenience, but there is no evident identity of properties and certainly no metaphysical necessity.³⁵

2. *For-me-ness.* Phenomenal states, e.g., pain, taste, see colours, and sad, are not to be distinguished from the phenomenon of these states. This contrasts to the distinction between these phenomenal states and the neural states as external objects of the mental and present in one's perceptual world. The phenomenal/experienced states may be referred to as what it is like for one to be in with which we are familiar directly (Block), or something it is like to be (Nagel).³⁶ Therefore we are conscious of these

³³ Thomas Nagel, "What Is It Like to Be a Bat?" (1974), in: idem, *Mortal Questions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), fifteenth edition, 165–180.

³⁴ Jerry A. Fodor, "Making mind matter more", *Philosophical Topics* 17 (1989): 59–79, Ernie Lepore, Barry Loewer, "More on making Mind Matter", *Philosophical Topics* 17 (1989): 175–191; see also: Erwin Rogler, Gerhard Preyer, *Anomalous Monism and Mental Causality. On the Debate of Donald Davidson's Philosophy of the Mental* (Frankfurt a. M.: Humanities Online, second edition; www.humanities-online.de).

³⁵ This is emphasized from von Kutschera, *Die Wege des Idealismus*, 201–202.

³⁶ Ned Block, "Concepts of Consciousness", in: *Philosophy of Mind: Classical and Contemporary Readings*, ed. David J. Chalmers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002),

states immediately by manifestations which are free of any judgment or any need for them to be conceptually framed, as if we were dealing with something totally unfamiliar. All phenomenal properties are conscious as such, i.e., it belongs to them to be experienced, lived. They stand for themselves as the for-me-ness of experience, that is, they are self-fulfilled by themselves and do not need any further filled intentions, as if there are hidden and signifying aspects (senses) to which we are pointed but not immediately aware. For-me-ness does not mean *with me*. Phenomenal conscious states have not a subject (given explicitly). Thus one must distinguish the phenomenal quality, even though it is “mine” as something I-less insofar as the I is not a theme. Pains and itches are not ownerless. The phenomenal consciousness is not reflective, but a self-manifestation of the lived-experience (*E*) as essentially one’s self-familiarity through one’s mental states. The self-ascription of these states is not a belief about something. The self-manifestation is self-evident in every moment. We feel pain, grief, and happiness unmediately and as such they are self-manifested and self-manifesting.

The distinction between the unmediated consciousness and the phenomenal consciousness, on the one hand, and self-knowledge and reflective intentional acts directed to the unmediated states of consciousness, on the other hand, is necessary because self-knowledge and intentional states are not accounted for merely by the primary unreflective level, but self-knowledge requires both and the latter is not possible without the former. The structure of consciousness permits us to conduct an analysis which is the self-articulation of its own transparency. This is not derived from other considerations apart from this structure.

(d) Self-Knowledge as I-Knowledge

1. *Indexical reference.* The distinction between the phenomenal consciousness, and self-knowledge comes to light when we consider that the conscious first-personal self-reference enables oneself to be present “as” oneself. Self-knowledge as intellectual *I-knowledge* in contrast to the phenomenal lived (*E*) consciousness is constituted by the self-reference. In the use of the first-personal pronoun, “ONE refers to ONEself as oneself”.³⁷ The I-knowledge achieved in the in the indexical “I” presents what before was present in the lived experience (*E*). This latter is oneself in an implicit way which the “I” surmounts because I am not now simply

206–218; Nagel, “What Is It Like to Be a Bat?”. On a critique on the anti-materialists, William G. Lycan, “VS. A New A Priorist Argument for Dualism”, *Philosophical Issues* 13: *Philosophy of Mind* (2003): 130–147.

³⁷ Castañeda, “I-Structures and the Reflexivity of Self-Consciousness”, in: *The Phenomenology of the ‘I’*, 264.

“lived” nor that for whom others and the world is, nor as someone with such and such features, whether or not shared by others; rather now I am present to myself *as* myself.³⁸ The epistemic self-reference is a presentation to oneself, which is also an unmediated acquaintance, and is not to replace by a third-person reference. But the I-knowledge is not a total transparency of I myself.³⁹ In this case we do also not exclude anomalous cases.

2. *I-sentences*. What is the role of the indexical “I” in I-sentences?

When a speaker uses the expression “I” he does not describe but achieves a unique kind of non-descriptive, non-sortal reference. The utterance of the word “I” presupposes a self-referential acquaintance of the speaker as its lived, and in this sense perceptual, evidence. Therefore the *act of I-saying* is not an intrinsic property of my unmediated knowledge of I-myself. The *primary elemental* self-“reference” is not reflective (relational), but the secondary “I”-reference is reflective, as is any property ascription to oneself. When I ascribe to me a property “being sad”, or a propositional attitude, e.g., “I believe something”, then I myself am part of a state of affairs, and I may be a subject of reflection, and deliberation. This is not a characterization in causal functional terms. In “I-sentences”, e.g., “I feel that I am hungry” is the first “I” an indicator and the second “I” is a singular term.

I-knowledge as “I think that ...” is a variety of self-reference as a conscious thought. But there is no *I*, which underlies the biography of person as substrate. All *Is* are ephemeral and subjective (private).⁴⁰

The epistemic *primal elemental* self-reference enables the articulation of: 1. self-reference by contrast between self and object, self-reference and intentional agency, 2. self-reference by contrast between self and

³⁸ The *de se* constraint and the direct attribution of self-ascription are also a critique on the Buddhist no-self view because the self-ascription is the guarantee that the believer is the subject of the belief; I ascribe the belief, and my other mental states to one self but not to any another entity, see Neil Feit, “Self-Ascription and Self-Awareness”, in: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*, 222–229.

³⁹ But we do not assume an *Ur-Ich* which is without a distinction of *essentia* and *existential*, as does Fink’s version of Husserl. See, Eugen Fink, “Die Spätphilosophie Husserls in der Freiburger Zeit”, in: *Edmund Husserl 1859-1959*. Mit einem Geleitwort von Friedrich-Wilhelm von Hermann (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2014), second edition, 99–115, Klaus Held, *Lebendige Gegenwart. Die Frage nach der Seinsweise des transzendentalen Ich bei Edmund Husserl, entwickelt am Leitfaden der Zeitproblematik* (Wien: Springer, 1963). On the time consciousness are to mention the studies, e.g., of Frank, Hart, G. Seel, and Zahavi.

⁴⁰ Castañeda, “Persons, Egos, and I’s: Their Sameness Relations”, in *The Phenomenology of the ‘I’*. But his analysis of I-Guise needs a modification.

present others, 3. self-reference with respect to an interaction between oneself and absent others.⁴¹

The three modes of adequacy the self-presentation of the unmediated consciousness, the self-manifestation of phenomenal states, and the unmediated epistemic self-reference to I myself are conscious as an adequate evidence by the immanent lived experience (*E*), and the perspective of our experience as the subject's point of view.

(e) Intentional Mental States

1. *Content of attitudes.* The epistemological condition of *intentional consciousness* (intentionality) is that we one wherein we lay hold of the propositional contents immediately. The intension is prior to the extension. Intentionality is a relation with respect to conscious mental states, but I am, at the same time, I am non-reflectively aware my myself conscious of something, as well as my other doings. When I have propositional attitudes then I am aware of these. I am aware of these in such a way that I may subsequently ascribe to myself these attitudes as conscious mental states, as when someone later asks me: When you were absorbed in the drama of the movie were you aware of yourself watching the movie through a flux of intentional attitudes? In response I would say, yes, I had these states, and I may ascribe them as my attitudes, and I cannot have a false consciousness about that. Therefore I have a pre-reflective, and pre-intentional consciousness about intentional states.

2. *Multiplicity by indexicality.* The *inadequate evidence* (intentional) of the external (transcendent) experience is evident in the manifold forms of indexical reference. We have the phenomenon of multiple entities of which we are aware in always new orientations. The inadequate evidence may be conceived as a matter of endless cross references in as much as each indexical reference, e.g., as being "here" and "now" refers to others, and together these references (*Verweisungen*) comprise the "world-horizon" which may be considered that of the individual as well as the intersubjective community. Without these expressions there is no cross reference because identification of objects is a matter of determining individuals, and this is a matter of establish the identity of object by means of identity-statements, sortals, and indexicals.

But fixing the relation between the mental (as manifest in language) and world is not the achievement of a single person, but an apperception of the perspectives of others when a third party comes into play (Simmel, Sartre: *die dritte Person*), but not in the sense of the a priori intersub-

⁴¹ Castañeda, "I-Structures and the Reflexivity of Self-Consciousness", in: *The Phenomenology of the 'I'*, 278.

jectivism.⁴² This is not inconsistent with renewing a version of monadology because all monads have windows enabling reciprocal observations. They are by their self-referential constitution at the same time observers, which make the distinction between self-reference, and reference to the external world, and others.

(f) Consciousness of Time

1. *Time and unmediated (pre-reflective) consciousness.* The structure of consciousness as the ubiquity of self-awareness, and its jointless unity is dissected, and articulated by time ultimately, that is, by the *consciousness of time*. It was Sartre's merit to recognize that "le cogito, instantané, ne peut fonder la temporalité".⁴³ This is recognized by the self-transparency (ubiquity) of the pre-reflective cogito. Time gives the consciousness its direction as a continuation of the unmediated (pre-reflective) consciousness of the flow of time: the pre-reflective cogito, if we consider it as "in time", is not what it is, and is what it is not (Sartre). This sentence is also the key for the understanding the consciousness of time because also time "is not what it is, and is what it is not".

Self-consciousness has also to explain the consciousness of time because time is at once made up of discrete moments as well as an unmediated unity of the consciousness. Time's flow is inseparable always also from an unmediated and consciousness of it; consciousness is a component of the whole: time-consciousness. Because of this inseparable unity the structure of consciousness is inseparable from the structure of time, that is, a unity in differentiation. This implies within consciousness a virtual opposition articulated by the self-articulation of time.⁴⁴ There is no unity of time and of consciousness without the unmediated (pre-reflective) consciousness. The unmediated consciousness is dissected by time in continuation. The problem is "what is the analysis of the connection between the world time, and the subjective consciousness of time, which we find out about the experience of time?"

2. *Circle of time.* The adequate evidence of the unmediated consciousness of one's intentional life is articulated, i.e., rendered an unity

⁴² On a critique on the a priori intersubjectivism with reference to Frank, Habermas, Henrich Tugendhat, see: Gerhard Preyer, *Selbstbewusstsein. Kritik am apriorischen Intersubjektivismus*, https://www.academia.edu/31417062/Gerhard_Preyer_Selbstbewusstsein_Kritik_am_apriorischen_Intersubjektivismus.

⁴³ Jean Paul Sartre, "Conscience de soi et connaissance de soi 1947", in: *Bulletin de la Société Française Philosophie* 42 (1948): 49, Frank, "Zeit und Selbst", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 128–129.

⁴⁴ Frank, "2. Wovon ist Selbstbewusstsein ein Bewusstsein?", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 257.

in a manifold by the temporality of intentional life, what we may call the *consciousness of time*; but by this we do not mean the consciousness of the time of the world, e.g., the temporality of a race. This adequate evidence of an unity in a manifold, is not disappeared by this “flow of time”. The unmediated (pre-reflective) consciousness is disconnected from recurrent cyclical pattern of the flow of time in terms of past, present, and future. It is not destructed thereby because the past and the future are constantly present (Husserl: *mitvergegenwärtigt, passive synthesis*) by the pre-reflective consciousness in the present. The past, the present, and the future are conscious as the distinction between the present future, and the future present. The past is not unreal, and the future is not fictive. This is not the distinction between earlier, and later series of the world time because the past is present as retention by the “living present”, and there is by the projection of the protentionality a future being that cannot begin by itself. It is reached in the present as self-transparency of consciousness only. The “flow of time” of “internal time consciousness”, e.g., the time of the perception of the race is disconnected by the intervention of world time, the time of the race, in the *pour soi*, which is conscious by the pre-reflective cogito. Call that the *insight* of the early Sartre’s philosophy.⁴⁵

(g) Existence-Consciousness

1. *Existential decision and self-determination.* The self-reference to I myself as an unmediated conscious state as an *existence-consciousness* (not as Heidegger’s *Zuhandenheit*) happens when I am conscious (self-aware but not aware of or about myself, that is, it is bound as a pre-reflective consciousness to a factual self-being, and not to something transcendent.

⁴⁵ It is a particular merit of the reinterpretation of Sartre by Frank to show this insight. J. Hart argues in his comment that he does not believe anyone familiar with Husserl’s writing could not make that ascription.

The question is “what is the relationship between the consciousness of time and the physical time?”. In the first step we make a distinction between both. The theory of time in physics is switched by the theory of relativity and quantum-physics. The influence of movement and its direction to time is confirmed by all experiments which are done (Einstein: space time – *Raumzeit*). The future time and the past would be reversible. The future and the past were an illusion only (Einstein). This is a relativization of our everyday life lived experience *E* of time as a time flow. The everyday life concept of time is based on the flow of present Husserl: living present. But his is not valid in physics. The problem is the time arrow, that is, the time flow goes in one direction. The physical explanation is from the so-called big bang time of the singularity is realized time as irreversible event. Yet the “big bang” explanation is a picture only. Another one is there is a negative infinite of time going back in the past (C. Wetterich). But one is not disputed that time required a physical realization. But all that is not the subject here.

From the subject's point of view existence is also a result of a decision and distinction. It is a self-referential happening whereby existence and phenomenon fall together by the distinction between both at once. It is an existential decision as a self-determination, and the distinction I made between I myself, and others is structured by time.⁴⁶ This is not a turn to the Heideggerian view of the *problem of metaphysics* because the self-reference we perform with the utterance "I am", or "you are" are features of *Dasein* itself, i.e. as the there/here of *Sein*. Heidegger has oversimplified epistemology. *Existence-consciousness* is a self-reference from the subject's point of view as a position in the world. Therefore there is no world without a self. This leads to another version of the *ecstatic Dasein* with a *circular* construction, that is, the *ecstatic Dasein* as a project comes back to itself from the future.⁴⁷

2. *Transcendence consciousness*. The existence-consciousness as the subject's point of view is constituted by time, and a project of I-myself thereby we have a future, and a past history. It is a transcendence-consciousness, and has to do with what is transcendent to intentionality. The transcendence of the existence-consciousness means that the subject's point of view is not founded in itself.

Frank emphasizes that the modern concept of *existence* goes back to Novalis „I must in regard to everything absolutely think in advance, *pre-suppose*. Does this not mean not *reflect upon*, not *posit afterwards*? Resolve: Pre-experience. Ante-type".⁴⁸ Frank interprets Novalis to mean that the apparent actual possibility of something or oneself does not adequately express in its (own) reality. Temporality is not merely an accidental property of an a-temporal subject of the consciousness, but being a consciousness is being a temporal being, and time dissects it in a flow. But

⁴⁶ It is not written *Ex-istenz* because existence is not to reinterpret from the being or an event of being (Heidegger). Heidegger's *Daseins*-analysis has not no subject's point of view because the hermeneutics of *Dasein* is to interpret from his question of being *Seinsfrage*.

⁴⁷ On critique of Heidegger's version, see: Frank, "3. Zeit und Selbst Oder: Wie sich präreflexives Bewusstsein differenziert", in *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 227–228. He argues that every project presupposes self-consciousness. Henrich argues in a similar direction.

⁴⁸ Novalis, (Friedrich von Hardenberg), *Schriften. Zweiter und Dritter Band*, In: *Das philosophische Werk I und II*, eds. Richard Samuel, Hans-Joachim Mähl, Gerhard Schulz, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1965/1968. In German: "Ich muß *allem* etwas absolutes *Vorausdenken* – voraussetzen – Nicht auch *Nachdenken*, *Nachsetzen*? *Vorsatz*. *Vorempfindung*. *Vorbild*. *Vor Fantasie*. *Project*", Novalis, *Schriften*. III, 199, no. 282 and II, 591, no. 284; Frank, "Zeit und Selbst Oder: Wie sich präreflexives Bewusstsein differenziert", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 227–228.

the romantic understanding of time does not take effect in continuation in philosophy.⁴⁹

The *existence-consciousness* is the subject's point of view as a temporal determined being within the *World* as an environment of conscious states ultimately, which we do not reach in a filled intention or actual presence by our consciousness. *World* as ultimate horizon is to distinguish from the concept of the world as the whole as "indivisible noumenon" (Kant, Castañeda), and the Old European ontology of the world as *universitas rerum*. The *existence-consciousness* is a phenomenological/internalistic self-evidence, that is, every mental state is determined by itself as a conscious state as an ephemeral consciousness, which cannot absolutely dispose about itself.

3. *Trans-intentional consciousness*. The *existence-consciousness* as being in the world is at the same time a trans-intentional self-consciousness as a consciousness of a trans-categorical consciousness (Karl Rahner), a non-propositional consciousness (Enomiya-Lassalle) of a trans-categorical reality (von Kutschera,⁵⁰ Sartre: *en-soi*). This is not a Kantian *Ding an sich*.⁵¹ *World* (transcendence as independent from the consciousness) as ultimate horizon as trans-categorical is not an object of intentionality and intentional states. There is no pathway by which we have this experience of transcendence definitely, and the experience of transcendence is not something able to be acquired through an act of will. The experiences themselves point the way to transcendence. It is beyond our conceptual and intentional thinking. The trans-intentional consciousness as the feature of the *existence-consciousness* is not a lived-experience (*E*) because I have not an experience of the *existence-consciousness* as a trans-intentional self-consciousness of the trans-categorical *World*.⁵²

So-called *existence-consciousness* is not a total self-transparency. Not only the world is rendered present inadequately. But also the adequate evidence I have about my-self in my lived experience (*E*) is dissected by time thereby there is no epistemic certainty about I myself in the *ecstatic* being in time. There are self-conscious states only. The foundation of

⁴⁹ Frank, "Zeit und Selbst Oder: Wie sich präreflexives Bewusstsein differenziert", in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 194–195.

⁵⁰ Franz von Kutschera, *Ungegenständliches Erkennen* (Paderborn: Mentis, 2012), 48; Karl Rahner, *Kleine theologische Schriften* Freiburg i. B.: Albert 1968, Hugo Enomiya-Lassalle, *Zen-Meditation für Christen* (München: Scherz, 1976), fourth edition.

⁵¹ Castañeda, "Metaphysical Internalism, Selves, and the Indivisible Noumenon A Frege-Kantian Reflection on Descartes's *Cogito*", in: *The Phenomeno-Logic of the 'I'*, 221–227. His view is that "Modest Transcendental Realism is compatible with Metaphysical Internalism and anchors it to transcendent reality The True, the Whole Indivisible Problematic Noumenon" (ibidem, 218).

⁵² Kutschera, *Ungegenständliches Erkennen*, 48–49.

existence is: there is a wholly existential unspecific knowledge, that is, a reality, which takes effect as a whole in our experience, and it is at the same time the spring of *freedom*. I maintain Kant's jargon of "transcendental" because there is an ontological internalistic evidence, which exists in the consciousness only, and constitutes the appearances by the non-thetic consciousness. This internalist evidence is the guarantee that our experience is inherent in our linking our self-experience of our mental states with the world-experience and world-constitution which our self-experience of our mental states brings about.

4. *Problem of existence.* The self-reference is immune to error through misidentification. This evidence has an indexical reference to *I* myself. The self-reference is not the reference of a "transcendental *I*" as a product of the transcendental apperception. It is a "trans-internalistic" position in the world, which comes to know itself as contingent and as embodied in a phenomenal (internalistic) evidence. This evidence is local. This is at the core of the problem of existence, and at the same time of the problem of social and communication: there are within my *pour-soi* no other *I*'s, no other minds and people. In my *pour soi* I myself am solitary also when this knowledge is gained by a symbiosis with others only. Call that an *existential transcendentalism* because the internal self-determination of the mental has as a 'ground floor' a transcendent reality. This goes along with the view that expressions of ordinary natural language has an ontological semantic feature.

5. *Self-reference, and the others.* The referent of "I myself" is always situated locally by symbiotic relations to others. We are monads, but with a view to the outside. From this point of view there is no omniscient interpreter/observer about the existence at all or about social intercourse. Most philosophers would not argue for an ontological and epistemological solipsism. The question is whether we may hold that we are monads ontologically because we cannot abandon the subject point of view. In holding for a kind of monadology one is not thereby a solipsist, i.e., one is not holding: I am the only one subject in the world.

Self-reference involves drawing the distinction between the internal and the external, which is at the same time the distinction between I myself and *the other*. Thereby self-reference goes along with the elementary fact that I myself am a singularity among other singularities. It is an elementary relationship of reciprocal observations, that is, we are within this relationship both a subject and an object of observation. A major philosophical task is to show how communication is possible under this condition. The elementary relationship between I myself and others (ego and alter ego) is at the same time the distinction between the relationship of ego to its environment and to others in his environment. The environ-

ment of ego is determined by the internal-external distinction from the subject's point of view. The subject does not have and her disposal what belongs to the environment, and therefore others are not at one's disposal. I cannot dispose about the look of the others. I face this look. The environment is the abstract other side from the subject's point of view. In contrary to this the others are subjects, which are also determined by themselves. This leads to a new turn of our understanding of others, communication, and the social, and their remarkableness as well.

For philosophical clarification, the epistemic-critical doubt is necessary because it clarifies what it means to be conscious, that is, mental states. It reveals that consciousness and its processes are as such internal and an experienced manifestation whatever may be the physical structure of the underlies experience. This is not a Cartesian scepticism of the Evil Demon. We like to think of this as *existential transcendentalism* because the internal self-determination of the mental has as a 'ground floor' a transcendent reality. Again this goes along with the view that expressions of ordinary natural language have an ontological semantic feature. We have from the *existence-consciousness* point of view also the option to renew the relationship between theoretical and practical philosophy.⁵³

3. Conclusion

The unmediated consciousness as being-conscious (present) without any mediation is a non-conceptual, pre-reflective, and no-relational consciousness. It is not mediated by perception, reflection, other acts, and judgements. It accompanied all mental states: phenomenal states, self-knowledge (I-knowledge) as a knowledge of myself as myself, intentional states, the consciousness of time, and existence-consciousness, which are conscious as varieties of subjectivity as a pre-reflective, and non-relational consciousness. This consciousness is not an awareness, or representation of something. The reflective consciousness is a secondary consciousness.

In conclusion: consciousness is not to be characterized generally and exclusively by intentionality and propositional attitudes. All mental states are also unmediated states. Having said this, we must also say that consciousness of others is typically to be conscious about *what is like* to be in this non-reflective manner. We hold that all conscious mental states immediately aware because that is the essence of being conscious as such. The *internal framework* of the mental is an analysis of the subject's point of view by the differentiation of the jointless unity of the structure

⁵³ On practical thinking: Gerhard Preyer, *Intention and Practical Thought* (Frankfurt a. M.: Humanities Online, 2011).

of consciousness, which goes along with the structure of immunity from error. This leads to the existence-consciousness as structured in time. The unmediated consciousness is the transparency of mental states as such. It is not intentional and a non-propositional consciousness. The existence-consciousness as a trans-intentional consciousness plays a particular role because it is beyond toward our present and our own mental states, that is, in Sartre's view, it is the existence-situation of our *ecstatic* being of the impossibility of the unification of the being/the past, and the *néant* (future), that is, the ecstatic temporality is penetrated, but not destroyed, by the *en-soi*. From this point of view we redraw the internal-external distinction between the mental, and the world from the subject's point of view.

The structure of consciousness is also to take in the analysis of *communication* and the social intercourse because the view of the others – our co-subjects – is the borderline of understanding other minds, and thereby the social. The otherhood is always paired with the incompressibility of others, which is not disappeared also in familiar, trustful, and intimate social intercourse.⁵⁴

Bibliography

- Block Ned. 2002. "Concepts of Consciousness". In: *Philosophy of Mind: Classical and Contemporary Readings*. Ed. David J. Chalmers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BonJour Laurence. 2001. "Toward a Defense of Empirical Foundationalism". In: *Resurrecting Old-Fashioned Foundationalism*. Ed. Michael R. DePaul. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- BonJour Laurence. 2010. "The Dialectic of Foundationalism and Coherentism". In: *The Blackwell Guide to Epistemology*. Ed. Jonathan Greco, Ernest Sosa, Matthias Steup. Oxford: Blackwell, second edition.
- Burge Tyler. 2007. "Mind-Body Causation and Explanatory Practice". In: Tyler Burge, *Foundation of Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cappelen Herman, Ernie Lepore. 2005. *Insensitive Sensitive Semantics. A Defense of Semantic Minimalism and Speech Act Pluralism*. Malden: Blackwell.

⁵⁴ Eric Tremault gives a fruitful comment to this question because he argues "pre-reflective self-consciousness is a phenomenal consciousness *tout court*". This is the self-transparency of the mental, which is determined by lived experience *E*. But it is not an inner awareness. It does not have any object. I thank James Hart very much for his detailed and emphatic comments which was helpful finishing the work. The text goes back to lectures at the Institute of Philosophy, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland, Erasmus exchange, 2016. I also want to thanks Prof. Dr. Urszula Żegleń and Dr. habil. Anita Pacholik-Żuromska for their philosophical interest and social intercourse about contemporary problems in the philosophy of the mental.

- Castañeda Hector Neri. 1999. "I-Structures and the Reflexivity of Self-Consciousness". In: *The Phenomenology of the 'I'. Essays on Self-Consciousness*. Ed. James G. Hart, Tomis Kapitan. Bloomington-Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Castañeda Hector-Neri. 1999. *The Phenomeno-Logic of the I: Essays on Self-Consciousness*. Edited by James G. Hart, Tomis Kapitan. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Castañeda Hector-Neri. 1974. "Thinking and the Structure of the World", *Philosophia* 4: 4–40.
- Castañeda Hector-Neri. 1975. "Identity and Sameness", *Philosophia* 5: 121–150.
- Chalmers David. 2010. *The Character of Consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cramer Konrad. 2016. "'Erlebnis' Thesen zu Hegels Theorie des Selbstbewusstseins mit Rücksicht auf die Aporien eines Grundbegriffs nachhegelscher Philosophie". In: *Stuttgarter Hegel-Tage*. Ed. Hans-Georg Gadamer. Hamburg: Mainer, second edition.
- Cramer Wolfgang. 1954. *Die Monade*. Stuttgart.
- Damasio Antonio R. 2010. *Self Comes to Mind. Constructing the Conscious Brain*. New York: Random House.
- Fink Eugen. 2014. "Die Spätphilosophie Husserls in der Freiburger Zeit." In: *Edmund Husserl 1859–1959*. Mit einem Geleitwort von Friedrich-Wilhelm von Hermann. 99–115. Berlin: Lit Verlag, second edition.
- Fodor Jerry A. 1989. "Making mind matter more". *Philosophical Topics* 17: 59–79.
- Frank Manfred. 2012. "Besteht Selbstbewusstsein in einem 'inneren Wahrnehmen'?" In: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Frank Manfred. 2019. "From 'Fichte's Original Insight' to a Moderate Defence of Self-Representationalism". *ProtoSociology* 36.
- Gurwitsch Aron. 1975. *Das Bewusstseinsfeld*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hart James. 2019. "From Metafact to Metaphysics in the Heidelberg School". *ProtoSociology* 36: "Senses of Self". Ed. Marc Borner, Manfred Frank, Kenneth Williford. Forthcoming.
- Henrich Dieter. 1967. *Fichtes ursprüngliche Einsicht*. Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann.
- Held Klaus. 1963. *Lebendige Gegenwart. Die Frage nach der Seinsweise des transzendentalen Ich bei Edmund Husserl, entwickelt am Leitfaden der Zeitproblematik*. Wien: Springer.
- Henry Michel. 1973. *The Essence of Manifestation*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff/Brill.
- Husserl Edmund. 1980. *Logische Untersuchungen* (2 Vol.). Unveränderte Nachdruck der 2. umgearbeiteten Auflage von 1913. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, sixth edition.
- Kutschera Franz von. 2009. *Philosophie des Geistes*. Paderborn: Mentis.
- Kutschera Franz von. 2006. *Die Wege des Idealismus*. Paderborn: Mentis.
- Kutschera Franz von. 1981. *Grundfragen der Erkenntnistheorie*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- Lepore Ernie, Barry Loewer. 1989. "More on making Mind Matter". *Philosophical Topics* 17.
- Levine Joseph. 2010. "Review Uriah. Kriegel, *Subjective Consciousness* (2009)". *Philosophical Reviews*.
- Lycan William G. 2003. "VS. A New A Priorist Argument for Dualism", *Philosophical Issues* 13: Philosophy of Mind.
- Miguens Sophia. 2001. *Una Teoria Fisicalista do Conteúdo e da Consciência-Dennett e os debates da filosofia da mente*. Porto: Campo da Letras.
- Novalis. (Friedrich von Hardenberg). 1965/1968. *Schriften. Zweiter und Dritter Band*. In: *Das philosophische Werk I und II*, eds. Richard Samuel, Hans-Joachim Mähl, Gerhard Schulz, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Preyer Gerhard. 2015. "On Contemporary Philosophy of Mind. From the 1950s Years to the Present". *Ruch Filozoficzny* 71, no. 4: 7–27.
- Preyer Gerhard. 2019. "Zur gegenwärtigen Philosophie des Mentalen". In: Wolfgang Röd, Wilhelm Essler, Julian Nida-Rümelin, Gerhard Preyer, *Geschichte der Philosophie Bd. 14: Die Philosophie der neuesten Zeit Hermeneutik, Frankfurter Schule, Strukturalismus, Analytische Philosophie*. München: Beck Verlag.
- Preyer Gerhard (ed.). 2018. *Beyond Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Preyer Gerhard. 2011. *Intention and Practical Thought*. Frankfurt a. M.: Humanities Online.
- Preyer Gerhard. 2013. "The Problem of Subjectivity: Dieter Henrich's Turn". In: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*. Ed. Sophia Miguens, Gerhard Preyer. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Rogler Erwin, Gerhard Preyer. 2020 (second edition). *Anomalous Monism and Mental Causality, On the Debate of Donald Davidson's Philosophy of the Mental*. Frankfurt a. M.: Humanities Online.
- Sartre Jean-Paul. 1948. "Conscience de soi et connaissance de soi 1947". *Bulletin de la Société Française Philosophie* 42.
- Sartre Jean-Paul. 1943. *L'être et le néant*. Paris, Gallimard.
- Searle John R. 2010. *Making the Social World. The Structure of Human Civilization*. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shoemaker Sydney. 1963. *Self-Knowledge and Self-Identity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Shoemaker Sydney. 1984. "Self-Reference and Self-Awareness". In: Sydney Shoemaker, *Identity, Cause and Mind: Philosophical Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shoemaker Sydney. 1984. "A Materialist's Account". In: Sydney Shoemaker, Richard Swinburn, *Personal Identity*. Series: Great Debates on Philosophy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shoemaker Sydney. 1996. "Self-Knowledge and Inner Sense". In: Sydney Shoemaker, *First Person Perspective and other Essays* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stegmüller Wolfgang. 1954. *Metaphysik, Wissenschaft, Skepsis*. Wien: Springer.

- Tye Michael. 2000. *Consciousness, Color, and Content*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Williford Kenneth, David Rudrauf, Gregory Landini. 2013. "The Paradoxes of Subjectivity and the Projective Structure of Consciousness". In: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*. Ed. Sophia Miguens, Gerhard Preyer. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Williford David, Kriegel (eds.). 2006. *Self-Representational Approaches to Consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zahavi Dan. 2007. "The Heidelberg School and the Limits of Reflection". In: *Consciousness: From Perception to Reflection in the History of Philosophy*. Ed. Sara Heinamaa, Vili Lähteenmäki, Paulina Reme. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zahavi Dan. 2005. *Subjectivity and Selfhood. Investigating the First-Person Perspective*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Summary

From the update of contemporary philosophy of the mental is concluded the research program of the analysis of the internal framework of the mental. It is sketched the structure of this framework by the unmediated (pre-reflective, non-intentional) consciousness and its dissection by time. The framework brings together the issues self-consciousness, phenomenal consciousness, I-knowledge, intentional consciousness, the consciousness of time, and the existence-consciousness focused on pre-reflectivity. Thereby we find a mediation between internalism and externalisms in philosophy of the mental and language. The self-binding of mental states as their intrinsic feature gives a hint of the place of mental in nature which is not to naturalize and is a limitation of physicalism.

Keywords: pre-reflective consciousness, intentionality, self-awareness, first-person knowledge.

Streszczenie

Nowy zarys filozofii umysłu

Współczesna filozofia umysłu to przede wszystkim program dotyczący analizy tego, co mentalne. Struktura tego programu rysuje się na tle badań nad prerefleksyjną, niezapśredniczoną i nieintencjonalną świadomością. W jego ramach prowadzone są rozważania nad samoświadomością, wiedzą pierwszoosobową, świadomością intencjonalną, świadomością czasu i świadomością własnego istnienia. Te cechy umysłu stanowią rodzaj pomostu między internalizmem a eksternalizmem w filozofii umysłu i języka. Wewnętrzne własności stanów mentalnych wskazują na to, że stany mentalne nie podlegają naturalizacji, a tym samym fizykalizm ma swoje granice.