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<Wakefulness and sleep – elementary periods of the world life. To fall asleep and to wake up as total phenomena of the egoical life. Awakening of interests and their affective horizons of relevance>[[1]](#footnote-1)

<§1. Waking up and falling asleep>

If I limit myself to the hyletic-kinesthetic sphere, then, since I, the one reflecting, am a mature man, it is already conceived of as a product of reduction from <the> universality of my and our **world life**, which is a **life of awakefulness and of sleep combining awake periods with awake periods through periods of sleep**, whereby yet there is within the respective awake period a consciousness of having slept and [there is] recollection of the previous awake period and the whole chain of “former” awake periods. And it is this recollection and this chain of recollection which makes possible within the present awake period the synthesis of itself with the past [awake periods]. This chain itself is a chain of mediacies. Each previous awake period which now is recollected, is recollected as carrying its recollection of the next previous awake period within itself, again the memory of this, etc. The “today” implies the memory of the yesterday, the yesterday [implies the memory] of the day before, etc. but mediately <it implies the memory of> all <former awake periods>.

The structure of this implication and synthesis within the implication, taking place in each awake period, and respectively being current within a flowing present eventually, in theory needs the temporalization of an own explication. Of course it is a higher but peculiar step of the kind that each concrete recollection (ontic – noetical) is accepted as that of a former flowing “present”. The recollection also implies my next previous flowing presents with their ontic acceptance of being, and **[588]** if I clarify these, anew. At the basis of this lies [the fact] that each flowing present in a continuous way intentionally implies the [present] having just passed by, this [implies] again, etc.: as a ground for all proper recollections. But only through current recollections and iterative syntheses of recollections I objectively gain as being my past and at first [I gain] my day as unity of the awake periods.

The beginning is the **waking up from sleep**; and here the recollection of the former awake period begins if I continuously go back. But the recollections emerge in a volatile way as volatile awakenings, and then proper, intuitional “reproductions”. My life proceeds as perceiving [life] and as synthesis within the perception. But it also goes back: By way of awakenings of the past and recollections with syntheses <it takes as a starting point> perceptions, <syntheses> of that which respectively within a first temporalization unitarily constitutes itself in the impressional flowing present and that which is recollected. The poring into that which has been awakened as recollection at the same time means awakenings from the recollected; and I indeed distinguish that which “**back then**” had been awakened within the former present which is now awake and again intuitional - <having been awakened> from the fresh and farther past (that of what “I was thinking”, what came to my mind, what I actually remembered) as well as awake as (objective) co-present and awake as being pre-expected – and that which becomes affective from my **current** interest, and comes to intuitional formation, like when I say: “Back then I only had eyes for this and that, but in my recollection I find that it was standing in front of me in a thus and thus oriented way, and I could have looked at it, I could have kept that which – as I still remember – was already awake, and could have brought it to intuitional recollection, etc.” Certainly, due to my former direction of interest this did not happen, nor was this possible insofar as it [the direction of my interest] belongs to the concrete content of the past. Like it was also not possible, to make the former interest – formerly not grasped in a reflective way –become simply thematic, like it now happens “subsequently” from my current interest. But to simply let this **constant possibility**, my current power of interest, enter the represented past, **[589]** and to let not only this [the represented past]speak from the now, the way it concretely was, but also that which it implies, now, afterwards, is still **important in a constitutive regard**.

How else could I understand sleep as interruption and interface of the awake life and this as temporal life having breaks within its awake temporality? I remember my “**falling asleep**” and my “**waking up**”. Within day-life the consistency of my acting life is familiar to me, [the consistency] of being now directed towards this or that, to occupy myself thereby, to be attracted by this or that affecting, to turn to it, etc. – All that within the continuously flowing realm of temporalization which does not become thematic itself in a reflective way. Falling asleep I “more and more stop acting”, at first my practical activity of interest. I let my interest “rest”, sink, I let my “thoughts” wander; they also contain an activity, an interest, I let it fall off, I do not play with any thoughts, unless it is meant as an introduction to becoming tired or to increasing my rising tiredness – i.e. my decreasing being involved. There are still rests of wakefulness, still rests of activity, of the being directed towards [something], [of the] being occupied. But in a peculiar mode which characterizes the whole normal falling asleep in contrast to the “going to bed but being unable to fall asleep”. This mode of the totally in all willing letting fall the interest together with the Ego-involvement is a mode which, since it does not modalize the isolated energy of the will, but the whole life of the will in one, rather is to be addressed as mode of the Ego itself in the way of its temporal life. While falling asleep I am still affected, but all power of affection is sinking; and if moreover I do comply, then the intensity of the attention, of the being attracted by the affecting, is weak and itself decreasing; thus in all and <as long as> I do not add any power as active intention which intends an approaching, an actualization, be it just <a consideration> how it is, how it could be, how it probably is or is not, let alone how it was dear to me, how it practically supported me according to my otherwise “reigning interests”. No interest does have any effect now within current willing and acting, now I am not aiming at anything, I am not striving, not desiring, not wishing to actualize at all. I can also say: The willing **[590]** stops ever more. It has a dimension that is like intensity, simply that <which> is conspicuous through its positive will: to aim at something, to wish to actualize something in “tense” energy, although the tension has its changing size, and [although] it is itself again a matter of such a will to increase the magnitude of energy.

In contrast to that the “Let it go away, let it go”[[2]](#footnote-2), the letting go the aiming of the will. The striving-for-something, tensing-up-for-something and approaching-the-goal through tension of the will, possibly until its actualization – that all suchlike is abandoned in general. The Ego of the will becomes passive in a certain sense. Not as if for example I pushed away my interests willingly, e.g. the interest in my job, [as if I] directed my thoughts towards something that I am currently interested in, or [that] willingly should interest me in order to get rid of my business interests’ spell; this is a method – and not a quite lucky one – of wishing to fall asleep, where I am still under the “spell” of my business interests in the hope of easier succeeding in letting the contribution of my will sink. The usual falling asleep is only volitional in the lying down for example, but with the expectancy that that will come to pass of its own accord within the weariness which usually is to be expected: a continuously more or less quick sinking of the will’s “power”. The interests of the day, the previously still intensively exerted interest in the job for instance or the political interest which stirred me while reading the newspaper, meanwhile are “exhausted”; thoughts from this sphere are not forcing any more, they are not attractive any more, not pressing, [they do not] tense and occupy the activity of my will. And thus that which otherwise happens to me still has its affects in a certain way, but it does not retain me; and the power of affection and the power of the exerting are not merely “small”, but rather they have the mode of the letting go, of the “I let them sink”. This letting them sink and <this> life within the letting sink and letting go of the will’s positivity which is thought of as a universal constant one (not within the up and down of a shooting up [of] and then lowering the positivity of my willing and acting), **591]** <is> the mode of the life which has just been awake but is falling asleep. It is clear that this inversion of the will’s activity or positivity into passivity, negativity also concerns the affections. Their attractive force is sinking as well. While letting go I also let go the affecting. If I relax, [if] I am within the mode of the totally relaxing interest, then the affections lose their correlative tension of the appeal.

These <are> **transitional phenomena** towards sleep. **Sleep itself** is the **limes** of this mode, the limes of the total relaxation of the affection and [limes] of being without action, being without will, relaxation of the will. This does not say that the habituality of my will, my lasting directions of will are lost. As persisting Ego I am still the same. But my stream of mental processes, my immanently yielding life has changed due to the falling asleep of the Ego; it goes over to a limes of the awake mode, of the will’s tension, which is itself not directly experienceable, since each experiencing itself is a mode of awake activity. It is just in advance simply imagined and well-known as a limes of the subsiding process, as a limes, the own sense of which implies that it does not designate a nothing, and [that] it is not an “idea” lying within infinity. Since their sense implies that it is an ideal pole of activities which indeed do approach the pole repeatably, but do not reach it – ever again leaving open an infinity of activity, however close they get.

Also within life in awake passivity we have differences of the affective strength and [of] the activity of the actualizing occupation, and in detail we also have the “letting” sink of the interest and of the affective realm, although in favor of other interests. The peculiarity of falling asleep thus is the **universality** of the Ego’s becoming passive as Ego of the interests; thus it is an important total phenomenon of the egoical life, that is, of the volitional life-mode, or rather, of the flowing life-present in which the Ego has a completely unitary negative mode of interest.

In contrast to that we now have the phenomenon of the **waking up** as waking up of the interests or initially of one interest, from which now the whole life takes over the usual form of wakefulness: The same Ego, which always already has its “acquired” lasting **[592]** interests, and can now be ignited ever anew. (And from here the issue of birth – and death?)

But here the question arises how we can satisfy this peculiarity lying within an originally awakening activity. And this again refers to the deficiency of all these explanations: that we did not take into account the diversity of interests, the questions of temper and the questions of the double habituality, of the acquired one and of the <habituality of> the original instincts.

<§2. Awakening of interests and of that which is relevant for them. Primary and secondary interest>[[3]](#footnote-3)

But now supplementing and enhancing considerations are necessary.

It follows from our presentations that the affectivity (like the activity) changes its mode in falling asleep. Its attractive force is the correlate of the striving towards; and each awakening is awakening of the striving Ego which has its respective habitual aspirations which are “awakened” in the awakening in their way, that is, by preferring the respectively already activated [aspiration]. The awakening of their different kinds of relevance follows from these, but apart from that <there are> also the awakenings of currently “sleeping” directions of striving. But obviously we are talking of **awakening** in different senses:

1) Awakening of this or that habitual “aspirations” or “interests”;

2) on the other hand awakening within the “exertion” of one of the interests (e.g. of the interest in the job) as my becoming conscious in a special sense of that which is relevant <in relation> to this interest. It emerges from my perceptual field, attracts me as something concerning me, coming into question for me. But also something past “emerges” from my memorial field, is awakened, and in simply this sense, that it concerns me as an Ego now exerting a job, becoming active within the job’s interest.

**[593]** Now of course we get into complications. For the awakening of memory my whole past professional life with its respective goals and its respective habitual interests has a distinctive characteristic and forms a unity of potential and preferred awakenings in itself. In a certain way now my whole past professional life, and – within the mode of anticipation, of the continuation of my aspirations in ever new, but not random changes of my goal-settings, actions – the future of my job constitute a unity.

If we at first consider the current life and that which is currently awakened of our own past, then the affection towards me, the attracting-me, the appealing-me as an Ego of the job and now as an <Ego> particularly acting thus in a purposefully actualizing way, obviously is a mode of activity itself. On the one hand because essentially it [the activity] only exists with such a horizon, the horizon of activity, focused on the doing, acting and its implied “towards-which”; on the other hand because this affection, which is not yet a turning to nor an active occupation with that which affects, indeed simply changes its mode in turning to something, that is, in such a way that we also find the being attracted within the specifically so called action, activity, occupation-with, and vice versa, looking back from it to its prior form, prior to the occupation, but are able to find the Ego’s being “related” to the affecting as correlate to the pull it exerts. And yet it is not the having turned to something, the being attendant at the occupation with it, within proper activity. This itself, as we know, has several modes proceeding in modal processes and essential shapes, where the Ego is acting in a unity of activity: thus [it has] the mode of the central activity (the manual acting so to say), the modes of the actively keeping something within one’s grip, again of the manual acting, of the temporally completely interrupting the action, later resuming it, the mode of the finished action and of the property as acquisition, etc. But always the difference remains between the active being attendant and the being directed towards the goal, towards the intermediate goal, [towards] the way, and the mere being affected, not yet being involved into activity in the proper sense (although within itself, like for example for the coming back again, something related to the affection has its role). But through all modes runs the intensity of **[594]** the Ego, of the interest’s identical, of the identical within the change of modes of its living-in-an-interested-way, in the widest sense of the modes of will, which for their part have an inner unity within their modal change, which also connects mere affection and action. By “willing” we usually always understand the aiming directed striving; but we may not overlook that it simply is a mere modal change which unites affection and action and not only as transition from affection into active occupation with the affecting, but also in the connection of the unity which the merely affecting has within the unity of an interest with the action directed towards something else.

The respective action within the flowing immanent present does not only have a horizon of affection, it “wakes” it, and [it does so] in the way of a process. But also other realms are awakened. The affective horizon of the interest in the job for instance enlarges itself, the awakening of different kinds of relevance proceeds, owing its power of awakening to the professional Ego and its motives. But other objects are awakened or have already been <awakened>, which are irrelevant for this interest in the job. And possibly this leads to a changeover of the interests; or the interest in the job loses its presentness (it is not its “time” now) and another interest (spoken in a new sense) is awakened and replaces the former one. A perceptual givenness emerges with a great affective force which it owes not to the interest in the job, the vividly exerted [interest], not receiving its force from its current energy. It wakes me as being not only a professional man, but for instance being a father. But my paternal interest was not present, thus the power of affection, which makes me sit up as soon as I see the child entering, and [which] motivates my paternal action, did not come from there. My paternal interest is now activated first of all.

Thus affection can show itself as apperception “my child”, moreover for example “who has stained its clothes”, and now my practical interest as educating father is awake. The apperception “my child” is already an apperception in this interest, it does not wake it. But it may be that I do not intervene or do <not> have to intervene; the life with the interest, the living within the will of the father does not mean: to continuously <do> something, “to act”,**[595]** to intervene. Also the “not doing anything” is within the will, as well as the failing to do something, the letting happen belongs into my willingness, but also within the awakened togetherness of both categories of interest the letting the one fall, the letting-it-so-to-say-sleep-again, for example by mediation of the “I do not need to intervene here” or “This is less important now, I postpone it to a more convenient time” (whereby my paternal interest has a new shaping in the form of a newly founded special will entering paternal habituality). It may also be that both interests remain awake: I am working, but secondarily I keep an eye on the child who is with me in the room. Thus a primary willingness is activated – with next goals and in a wider connection of purpose to which I am centrally directed, which I am focused on – and a second one where the being directed to is not lacking, but <which> consists of a secondary, being incidentally awake to that purpose, but which possibly turns into a primary one. But the primary and the secondary, the being concentrated on and the being distracted from, as can be seen here at once, can have a different sense. – It is my working time now, these are the hours of my job in which I am a professional: The whole connection of purpose with its unity of organizing the will is now within primary awakening; I am focused on it, and therein in the other sense [I am focused] on the next, the theme of the “manual” work. As scientist <I am focused on> my now considered thoughts, my current decisions, my now successful insights, now functioning as premises for further mental work.

All that characterizes the unit of the flowing **closer sphere of concentration**, which for its part ranges itself into the wider vivid, flowing **connection of concentration**, into the awakened connection of interest, which, grasped in the flowing change of its co-functioning memory horizons (as horizons of affection), constantly is a unity, the unity of the interest in my job, the way it indeed concretely is for me in its vividness. Awake interest in one sense is awake in this presentness of an actualized vividness, actualized with such a central realm, of that [vividness] of the act, of the being directed towards the now practically possible, now graspable, now to be done at first, or already being in the course of work, or still to be abandoned, to be deferred, which is centrally **[596]** thematic, but through which goes the modally changed being-directed-towards, which I aim at furthermore and eventually. By jumping forward I can temporally shift it itself into the center.

<§3. Wakefulness as awakenness of all interests and of their horizons of relevance. The whole pre-given world as world of interests being encompassed by the wakefulness>

But are the other, not awakened interests not in another way awake by my being awake as well? I, the Ego of the interests, am awake, and thus **all interests** are awake, or, which is the same, **all [interests] are awakened when I am awakened and [when I] am now awake**. How is this to be understood? But at first in the following way: If the interest pre-eminently standing within the course of activity, of the actual occupation, of the actual activity, the “awake” one in this sense, keeps its movable horizon of relevance in awakeness, in co-wakefulness, continuously reshaping it, enlarging it in the directions, letting it go in those, etc. <and> if thereby go along possibly secondarily awake interests temporally changing into exertion <and> if thus a pell-mell positing of connected streams of activity happens, - I still do not sleep with regard to the surrounding world being irrelevant thereby. The lacking of the interest is not that of the sleep, and this means eventually: **In wakefulness (as correlate of sleep) there does not exist any absolute lacking of any interest at all, and that which is called “proceeding without interest” is itself a phenomenon of relevance on the lowest level**. Namely in such a way like in the togetherness of multiple interests currently active in becoming prevalent or in the togetherness of current interests from which only one is manually exerted, in acting activity, while the other [interests] are still present within the willingness of the letting go, of the being deferred, of the now disregarding, - thus like, as I say, there are differences between something relevant and something irrelevant <between> that which is now interesting, which comes now into question, and <that which> does not come into question, thus the same holds true in general for the totality of interests in which I am the respective Ego. They are all awake, i.e. **in the course of my world-life my wakefulness encompasses the whole [597] pre-given world from the perceptual present** and from the spatio-temporal world as such being awakened along with it. That which is being perceived is already within its interest although this interest may be such an [interest] of the lowest level of relevance. The world which is there for me respectively, originally, appearing itself and in first originality in the way of the perceptual field, is there for me as a **world of interest**, and the way of its being-for-me respectively is a way of how it interests me, a way it is conscious from the current primary and secondary interests, and already has a sense of being from there, or takes over a sense of being from the activity. **I am constantly a volitional Ego** and as an awake [Ego I am] within volitional aimings, and within the change of volitional modalities. I am continuously aiming at something, and I have goal-horizons verified in advance, intensions and horizons of intension, but respectively [I do have] something which I – immediately creating its possibilities, considering and acting manually – intend. The intension is always related to <that> which I have in advance and from earlier times as that with which I have further intensions. And thus I always have something already pre-given, a **pre-given world** in flowing mobility and related to that the process of the current activities, eventually leading to a currently reshaping action, and ending in a new possession, something now being for me. But being in general with a practical sense, which requires further actions, or with a sense of acquisition, which is to be rampant in future, within the goal-settings predelineating themselves in the course of life. Affection, awakening has its relation here to the course of activity, in which a unitary interest, a habitual unity of will which is horizon of special willings with special goals at the same time, makes an impact, predelineated ever anew within the affecting doing, forms itself ever more, that is, reshapes itself. **That which is awakened already has its face of interest**, it is already apperceived in a corresponding way, and as that it has – not just now emerging anew, but having <such a [face]> already without further ado – its modality of will. But certainly, this “having already”, this pre-givenness, is **apperception**, is not direct “reproduction”, <but> resumption of a formerly grounded sense of purpose (for example in the form of a workpiece having been left, being unfinished, or [in the form] of the already wrought instrument for a **[598]** now resumed purposeful activity). An apperceptive transmission happens in the widest measure and ever anew: Something similar is apperceived with a similar convenience and thus practically is accepted as if it were itself formed and provided for that purpose.

On the other hand we had the other affection, the awakening of interests which now are not present by the course of the experience life putting something already being into our scope of view, that, which, being apperceived in the shape of its purpose, soon brings to life its **horizon of interest**, partly in such a way that it for its part reminds of something, symbolically (“inductively”) awakens anything which is of this kind, and thus brings to life a sphere of interest. Within the course of experience thus interest is continuously brought to life, it is “awakened”.

But how do the interests “sleep” within the awake Ego? When I am going for a walk for instance and talk of everyday things with my companion, how is my scientific interest in my job sleeping at that moment? How do my worries concerning the fate of a young friend, which have been continuously aggrieving me for weeks, sleep? Is my stroll, the daily rest period within the connected unity of my professional life, not being accepted by me as a rest period, equipped with this sense of being? Did I not lay down the quill with the “It is time to stop for today”? Is the break of stopping not a mode of the act-life coming from my willingness, [a mode] of the interest, and of the interest life which I call “professional life”, in itself a component, itself merging an intentional sense of acceptance into it? And now the recreational activity, the going for a walk, the awakening of any everyday interests having been “eliminated” within the professional work, being “untimely” during it [during work], having been inoperative. Does the stroll as recreation not have its continuously vivid sense of purpose for me, although within conversation I am primarily directed towards its themes and am occupied with it in a “focused” way? Does it not have its time, at first the everyday, vague measure of time and point of time and its spatio-temporal extension within the “back and forth”, the previewed “how far”, until it is time to go back, etc.? Are these not willingly constituted elements, something conscious as being accepted along with the stroll, although I possibly express it only at the point of return: “It is time **[599]** to go home”? Obviously in all that a **total connection of the interests in the job**, of the corresponding professional actions, of their goals, intermediate goals, means, ways, of their intentions, acquisitions in their respectiveness, is vivid in their being deferred which is purposeful itself (like in other cases of their annoyingly being deferred through disturbance), conscious in its way, although in other modes of the being awake, always modes of interest, modes of will, but simply modes of subtleness, of a certain being distant from the center of the originally springing activity. Both, **job and recreation**, form themselves in the special forms of the time which is co-indicated at them, a **unity of interest**, a dual unity so to say from modalities of the “will”, providing for their awake being.

It is not different with the other interests and their times. All form a unity eventually, and all are awake interests within the wakefulness; and the **wakefulness** means that they all, all-unitarily intertwined, form a **weave of modes of the will** centered within the Ego-pole. Thereby certain modes of the will as being most close and closer weaves of the properly acting activity have a continuously changing central position, yet constantly persisting in its form of most proper activity, in which the whole further, ever more “subtle” life of intertwined modes of the will of correlative shapes is concentrated. All modes of the temporal “letting a proper activity go”, of temporal interruptions through disturbance belong to these intertwinings as vivid unifications as well, but also all modes of the volitional activity, directed towards the governing of the whole awake egoical existence, unifying itself synthetically through all awake periods under the idea of a volitional life, in which all special interests are not as always and necessarily intertwined, but [in which] all are subordinate to the unit of an interest, of a “purpose of life”, being in control of all special purposes by predelineating their form once and for all. Certainly this does not suffice if it is not made understood how my Ego’s life of interests “encompasses” that of other Ego-subjects within itself, how after that my volitional life and that of all fellow subjects of the world which is common to me and to them, which for me and for “us all” is the common field of all practice, is “internally” a **single intertwined volitional life**, with forms of unification, which **[600]** <on the one hand> are separated into those being **my** Ego’s own ones, being centered within my Ego-pole and my current activities, and into those belonging to the Ego of each other as being **his** <own>, <and> on the other hand into those forms of unification with correspondent volitional modes which constitute the interpenetration of the single-personal unities of interest as combining into the unit of communication. The “living alongside each other without any relation”, the “not having to do anything with each other”, the “having no common interests” itself is hereby just a modality of communication, and of a very remote connectedness of will and of life.

To clarify all that, eventually to understand that the world in every sense in which it is **our pregiven world** – and even with the core sense of an ego-foreign, mindless nature – is a **volitional formation** in the widest (in an outrageously wide and widest) sense, an “**intentional formation**”, and to understand thereby that which structurally makes this vividness of the world’s being-for-us, or rather of this world as formation of the life, as being proper to ourselves, <and> to clarify from there the last being sense of the world, proceeding from issue to issue within the systematic inquiry, <to> create a “metaphysics”, a “philosophy” understanding the ultimate things, - this is an exuberantly big task, and still [it is] a task which is to be tackled systematically, which is to be exerted in systematic work from level to level.

But many big mysteries remain after these rough considerations. How are we supposed to understand the associative awakening and recollection, and for example to firmly keep the difference of suchlike to the going back to the just created premises happening within proper activity, which are yet standing back within the keeping during the new steps, in order to be drawn and exploited later only within the change of function? Or the way that, within the mechanically handling with instruments and material, now this now that is grasped, used, formed, etc.? Does not associative awakening happen there as well? Within the process of the material’s shaping I am now at that point that now it needs to be cut, now to be punched, now to be glued, etc.; each point reminds me of what I am supposed to do, of the instruments which I have just laid aside, and which temporally lay regardless within my realm or within the box, and which are to be fetched **[601]**, etc. Is not everything an **associative connection** there and [is not] everywhere an associative awakening at play?

I wake up and I am standing within the context of my life: Dressing, having breakfast and then beginning to work. Yesterday’s work already comes back to life by the sight of the desk or even more so through the piece of paper laying out ready, on which I stopped writing yesterday. A chain of association, going over into recollections, and the whole a concatenation of activity within the unification of an interest life, especially of the professional interest. Intermediately that which is now represented reminds me of a passage in **Kant**, of thoughts which I turned towards the same and yet less maturely formulated issue, etc., thereby [it reminds me of] the past situation and the former life context, while possibly sliding into the interests, efforts, worries, grievances of the former time; this possibly leads me back again in associative awakening to similar grievances of another life period, etc.

In how far is the association there something proper, a connective form spread over the whole life, a form of occurrences of awakening, of recollection, but also inseparable from that, [in how far is it] a performance of apperception, of the conception according to the past of that which is present, of anticipation, of the conception of that which is coming according to that which has come? How about the universal temporalization of the universal association, reproduction, apperception?

1. 14th – 16th June 1932. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As to the expression „Let it go away, let it go“, see above page 500, note 1 [German edition] – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 16th June 1932. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)