**No. 36**

**Beginning of the phenomenological reduction (mid-January 1935)**

<§ 1.> One’s own consideration concerning the phenomenological reduction

I perform the phenomenological epoché. In turning my regard I have the Ego in its „subjective“ and the first apodicticity. This includes for me, the philosophizing one, the overview over some unintelligibility having become sensible for me, which I have thought through in my being unsatisfied with the situation of science, the situation of the philosophical world knowledge, namely insofar as it had been something motivating for the epoché: I was driven from these unintelligibilities – in the explication of that, which was weighing on me as unintelligible – towards the universal unintelligibility of the world and of my world life, of our world life, therein of the scientific life, but also of the whole further life.

After all I was unable to further accept that as a matter of course, which had presented itself to me as an unquestioned ground for my and our human cognizing, my philosophy and my science. As a scientist though I was actually at a will for a knowledge, which should be understandable through and through, which should be grounded through and through, truly transparent, truly apodictic, immediately or mediately.

Thus I find myself *eo ipso* within some universal skepticism, not within a negation of the world and of all my practical convictions, but in the state of “I do not understand anything”, or that, which I do understand somehow, is based on unintelligibility called matter of course there, and thus at bottom and from its bottom it is unintelligible. But I do not want to accept the unintelligible as if it were intelligible, but I remain in the will to cognize the world, in the will <to> bring that, which is given in the form of something not understood to that of intelligibility.

Basically, this is the situation from which theory, philosophy do spring. First of all an interest in the world to merely get to know it [482](experience not yet sufficiently intelligible as a one-sidedness), then amazement about the knowledge itself resulting in something unintelligible, etc.

But now I am not given the being itself as such nor do I have true being and truth through the work of science (the positive one in the broadest sense), but I have the phenomenon world, phenomenon universe of the being together with the sciences’ cognitions of being, that is, I have the universal unintelligibility with the content “world” and divided within the special [instances of] unintelligibility belonging to the world for me, for us, having belonged [to the world] for men, for peoples, civilized humanities, etc.

These [instances of] unintelligibility as such, the first realm of the “phenomena”, are for their part something being in a new sense, something being accepted by me, something to be explicated in truths, which I verify and determine, and thereby <I gain> apodicticity for the first time, such [apodicticity], which has no unintelligible ground behind itself of such a kind, which the former cognition and science had. Namely, and this is important: That former cognizance **rested** upon matters of fact, and, universally speaking, it rested upon the uniform manifoldness of matters of course, which the title “world for us” and thus “for me” does comprise. All the opinions concerning the world reach into this, the modes of appearance as perceptions, etc., the distinctions between true and false ones, between those verifying themselves and those being like an illusion, etc. Always of course something was accepted already or had been made a matter of course through verification, and then on the ground of these preceding, that is, grounding matters of course, having been used within the acceptance, all the rest, etc. This is “**pre-givenness of the world**” and of our existence in the world – as a “ground” of the whole existence in all human acts.

I have released myself from this ground in the epoché, I thus do not have any founding matters of course. And now I have, instead of these matters of course, within my turn of regard: The being instances of unintelligibility and myself as viewing them, and now I have this as being. Here I bring that to a new acceptance, which in the former sense is ground-less, it is founded in nothing worldly pregiven in the mode of acceptance.

[483] **This is the basic character of the beginning**: The universal unintelligibility shall be removed, and this can only happen if I perform an apodictically original positing, and gain a ground, which does not presuppose anything of the unintelligible.

I still do not know now, whether and how I am to gain intelligibility as such – at any rate I do have an “absolute” ground in the positing of the “world phenomenon” and of the Ego as a performer.

<§ 2. Epoché. The world phenomenon in its temporal dimensions>[[1]](#footnote-1)

Repetition:

1. Considering the unintelligibility of the world from philosophy – leads to the epoché.
2. Considering that, which I can have and cognize within the epoché, and that, which I have as a world of natural attitude.

“I do perform epoché now and was recently, but [I] was not in the epoché, the world was accepted by me, now I abstain from acceptance.” – Which kind of I is saying this? The Ego after all. “That the world was accepted by me” does not have the sense it used to have, if I had spoken in such a way prior to the epoché or were speaking in such a way now, without being in the epoché. How do such statements come about? I can perform and again dissolve epoché, compare the worlds and the times within and outside of the bracket. All this again needs consideration.

I within the epoché of all pregiving acceptances as such onto which I wanted to build a world cognition, I as the I of the epoché still have the attitude of striving towards universal cognition, towards “world”- cognition: only that that, which has been accepted by me as world so long, as immediately a matter of course or as already intelligible from mediate, from scientific cognition and as premise now for further cognition, has the stamp of unintelligibility and is subject to the epoché.

[484] But now I again have something being from original positing, the first apodictic givenness free from pre-givenness, that is, this world phenomenon, i.e. the pregiven world in a “bracket,” in the epoché’s acceptance-modification, “concretely” as I mentally live world now, lasting, in the change of the worldly content, continuation of the former having a world within the unmodified pre-givenness, but within the willful modification of the epoché beginning afterwards.

That, which is now streaming the way it presents itself, as it was originally viewed and given, is now my “world” instead of the world in the natural, in the former sense (or the first of my new “world”), and to this new being belongs its form of the “stream,” of its changing itself. And what is more: Thereby I now have a time, which indeed is not this streaming the way I have it as a standing-streaming Now, but this implies as always: a time, insofar as I do have the now streaming one of the phenomenon “world in epoché” as a ground for the memory of the former streaming and given therein that, which had been “content” previously and is no more, but has been remembered now. And again: The memory of the epoché’s point of beginning, and from there the memory of the pregiven world in its mode, which had been pregiven in a streaming way and as that had been pregiven as such, <the world,> which was accepted as being in a changing content – without any epoché.

The way I now have the current world phenomenon perceptually within the Now, in brackets therein the spatiotemporal world as that, which is currently accepted by me, thus in brackets its spatiotemporality, I have by performing memory as memorized the memorized world phenomenon and in brackets therein the spatiotemporality formerly being accepted by me in my former present; this <is> partly world though, which had been in brackets, and partly, prior to the memorized epoché, [a world] not in brackets.

The world phenomenon, that, which is now being for me, stands within a “phenomenal” time, in which it is now a present world phenomenon for me, has behind it my past world phenomena, the past epoché and the stretch of my past, in which I had accepted: world as such, and the way it was accepted by me.

[485] This world was accepted by me though, but is not accepted by me now. It is enclosed within the universe of the questionability, of unintelligibility, of the epoché. The world which is accepted by me as the respectively being one, is not merely accepted by me as the present world in the sense of the present belonging to the world’s being sense itself, but as the world, that has this present in its realm of worldly pasts and futures, the world, which has its being in its modes of omnitemporality. And thus it is pre-given, is the universe of the founding matters of course for the universal cognition and for all practice built on cognition.

I have within the current performance of the epoché the stretch of past performances of the epoché, and also for each phase of the performance together with the whole omnitemporal world in epoché, that is, within the acceptance together with the sense content, which makes it become the formerly pregiven one. This streaming now and having been put in the acceptance of being is a world phenomenon, and this not in an empty and abstract way, but concretely as content of the epoché’s attitude, which itself belongs to the being and the now actually to be posited in a reflective way. And what is more, this epoché is being as a mode of changed acceptance of the world and it implies, corresponding to the world time, as correlate a parallel, correlative time of acceptance, the mode of acceptance’s time in the epoché, and of the mode of acceptance of the modified acceptance’s egoical time and that of the world phenomenon itself prior to the epoché, mediated by the time point of the mode of acceptance “change of the acceptance of pre-givenness into epoché.”

Due to the epoché I have, instead of the pre-given world, world as a fullness of world-timely form, a new universe of being, incrementally opened up. “Guiding line” for this whole explication is the “pregiven” world in the way of the good sensefulness of this talk, which has grown from the sense-investigation concerning the matter of course, intelligibility, scientificality, and which leads to the epoché. Thereby different things need to be heeded. Most of all: Within the performance of the epoché I perform a “turn of the regard.” In the “natural” having a world I simply do have a world, and in a cognitive way – in a naturally cognitive way – it is the being, which I have priorily and want to determine in a cognitive way, directed towards “true being” in predicative truths. In the performance of the epoché I do not yet have the world phenomenon as a **field of being**; I only gain it [486] when I grasp the world phenomenon in the change of attitude, posit it as being, as a theme of experience and cognition.

Performing epoché its correlate “obviously being world in abstention from the performance of acceptance” or “world put into brackets” indeed quite immediately stands before me. But it is something else, that I make this “world in bracket” a theme for cognition, posit it as being.

The naturally pregiven world is, when I reflect and describe the way of pregivenness, given to me during sense-investigation as constantly perceived, in between memorized, not intuitably or intuitively hovering, etc. In any case a constant core of the most immediate intuitiveness carries the naturally pregiving “world consciousness.” The world phenomenon, grasped in that turn of the regard, is anyway directly and quite immediately grasped in an “intuitive way”, it is its way originally there for me, perceived in its way, and perhaps this here is not everything and the “perceived” [is] a core. Nay, we have already extracted manifold and quite implied things above, which do not truly come into acceptance, and even in obvious apodicticity, and this may only be a small beginning.

Furthermore we need to point out that I, in view of the world phenomenon and talking of it, am inclined, to talk of me, the Ego, in a second, further reflection. Actually it is not implied in the world phenomenon itself, but “my” world phenomenon is simply that, which I as Ego subject of the epoché and as that making it a theme in the alteration of my attitude bring to the acceptance of being, and it is only something else, to bring to acceptance the Ego itself as the performer and owner of the acceptance.

<§ 3. Natural attitude and epoché. Reduction to the Ego.>

Ego. I in the unintelligibility of the world’s matter of course, I, training epoché, I have the world phenomenon graspable through the epoché. Prior to the current positing it is “there”, it is.

Second pre-givenness “produced” through the epoché. The first is the pregiven world as such. Natural life, from [487] which I have exited consists of meaning out some single worldly thing in single acts, <to> be occupied with it in an experiencing, treating way, by anything respectively affected “from” the world, which is unthematically “*a priori*” always in acceptance as horizon of acceptance, or rather, horizon of being – simply being world, “from which.”

It remains as it was, “being” – as it was in the change of modalities of the different kind (in an enlarged sense). Insofar I have, when I again exchange the attitude of the epoché and the natural attitude, a modification of performance. And this means, I am as a performing Ego “a priori” a thus or thus performing one, and again thus or thus modifying the performance by my changing it from naturalness into over-naturalness or vice versa. And the changing is itself a mode of performance simply of this change, in which I have at hand both correlatively, to posit it as something being into one or another mode of performance, that is, to be able to again perform the positing “this or that.”

I am a performing Ego on different levels, that is, *a priorily* performing in the performance of a universal acceptance and having in acceptance, and performing as an Ego I am in an order of founding: The first is pre-givenness of the world and therein we, therein I as living in the world.

I am and we are in the world life in constant certainty of being of the world in such a form that we have a world horizon and are singly busy with something real, that we can reflect on us as Ego subjects and [on] our doing, I on me, I on the others as others, thinking or doing this or that, and thus through them also <on> further ones. We can thus make us a theme as performers of the world consciousness and of having a world horizon, of a common world in horizonedness, of being related on the same world in subjective and collectively different ways of consciousness, ways of acceptance. On the other hand we are in the world, we are for others and possibly for us ourselves respectively real things of occupations, straightforwardly there like things, as man among men, these as realities having the particularity of being two-sided, in one bodies and in them and through them acting Ego subjects, with which one [488] can occupy himself in a special way now concerning the body [side], now the psychic side.[[2]](#footnote-2)

But obviously it is another attitude 1) to straightforwardly live, thus living as an I within the We or else to have as a We straightforwardly world or something worldly as a theme for occupation, among that animals or men; 2) to perform the **special** consequently personal reflection and not to have the world or something worldly as such as our theme, but universally to have as a theme only the personal Ego subjectivity, we-subjectivity and the ways they have conscious world in a worldly living way, how they experience singly or commonly, judge, act, transform world, how the world is for them respectively in subjective ways of opinion, ways of appearance, [ways of] acceptance.

We are on both sides in the natural attitude from the egoical connection and tradition, <from which we> have world and live in the world; in the second case thus as well. But we are purely <related> to Ego subjects and egoical community, to them as having a world and being occupied within the world, which respectively is for them, to their acquisitions as acquisitions. – This is a “psychological” attitude, a “socio-cultural” one. All that, which is ascertained thereby, belongs to the world itself.

Something essentially different is the epoché of the universal way of performance of the “natural attitude,” which I, the one investigating sense, am performing for me. The epoché performs itself within me, the “orphaned” Ego. **My becoming aware** of the objective world, the one “being in itself,” essentially having a relatedness alternately to completion and enrichment within the We, of it presupposing the open horizon of the communalized **We** in its “objective” sense. But I soon become aware of the world having its final ground of acceptance within me myself, within me having other ones as co-subjects merely from my life of acceptance, and that thus, as I take them as worldly objective, I perform this way of acceptance myself and from my accepting have already presupposed some other Ego subjects. Thus [489] I arrive at the “Ego;” No sense having as correlate *alteri* in necessary co-acceptance does belong to this any longer. I also see a world of acceptance belonging to this Ego, which is not a human one in the world, for me, standing in the epoché.

And now we need to consider that, which I have explained on the previous pages.[[3]](#footnote-3)

<§ 4. Life within the epoché as a *quasi* life world and the identity of the Ego in natural and transcendent attitude>

I as Ego of the epoché discover myself, that is, as an Ego performing manifold acts and having a new universe of something being from direct experience, cognizing it in a way theoretically directed towards this, something immediately experienced, and again in an open horizon. At first I become aware of the “world phenomenon” though and from this of me as having it and as being a “phenomenon” in this correlation according to the categorical sense having newly been given to me. Furthermore, that which has been explained above, [I discover] my temporality, the correlative one of my phenomenon and of my occupation with the phenomenon, and that, which means explanation here.

I perform *quasi*- world life and I consider the actualities and possibilities being for me in the world, the correlations of Ego- and We subjectivity belonging to it as a human-personal one and world as that, in which persons are living, and from which it is accepted as constantly being for them as such, has subjective ways of appearance, etc. But all that has for me the bracket and is not my egological life as world life pure and simple, but egological life is the bracket modification, making the as-if, my current *quasi*-having a world and world life. I discover how this modification proceeds, grasping into my egological memory, etc.

I then discover the change of performance, which is my ability in advance, to restitute again a natural attitude, which indeed had been a ready attitude for me, for me, the Ego. Thus, examined closely this implies: I discover, that natural attitude is a [490] transcendental one insofar as it is my, the same Ego’s, attitude: Going back in memory I find myself, **the same** Ego, in the way of performing of the “natural attitude”, and this implies, I discover it as a former way of performance of my Ego, which living in its performance was not aware of it itself in a thematical way. The memory is a transcendental one, but [it] is characterized as a transcendental change, as a change of performance of the former Ego, which lived prior to the change within the transcendental performance, in which world was accepted as such, and [in which] the transcendental performance, transcendental as that of the Ego, was not conscious, not accepted.

I also see: Only by my being already in the motivation to the epoché and having been from a certain immanent time point on, only thereby can I find all that through the stretch of memory back for the past world stretch. In truth the possibility to transcendentally understand it never lies without further ado in the natural having a world, but the all-temporality of the world is revealed as having behind itself some being transcendentality only after the epoché has occurred, but in a being, which currently could only become from the epoché having occurred.

I remember the past world as a world, which had appeared to me in my past prior to the epoché from my respective past Now in such and such a way in an ever again changing way, and had been given as purely and simply being. I as an Ego, I perceive the phenomenon world within the streaming standing Now. The world, as it is conscious to me perceptually now, but modified as a phenomenon through my transcendental attitude, is a transcendentally-present phenomenon.

In a natural attitude: I remember and have a series of memories now, I arrange and combine them respectively to the unity of a succession of memories, which can be run through. This current memory is a memory of something past, which is now “hovering before” me, as if I am seeing it again, perceiving it again. Thereby it is remembered how the world was accepted by me previously. It [the past] is perceived as this modification. Again modified within the transcendental epoché it belongs to my transcendental present, which is as a current world phenomenon and a memory of former world phenomena, then memory of [491] the epoché and the world, the way it had been world pure and simple for me and the way it appeared thereby respectively. There are two memories, two times, covering each other, the modified one and as a simply implied one. The modification of the memory is memory itself – a transcendental one.

<§ 5. All psychic immanent is in transcendental turn modification of the natural-human and still covers itself with this>

But this is a too fast and therefore not satisfying procedure. Current world present needs to be taken in a concrete way, and there many kinds of differences play their role. I have a mobile field of perception with objects in changing ways of appearance, giving themselves from different sides, in different perspectives, as close things and farther away things, oriented towards different directions from me and my body; the things persisting, disappearing from perception, but I come back to them or they reappear, are recognized, I again remember them, also I experience other men and enter a community with them through communication, I afterwards change my apprehension of the things, etc.

And this whole “I now perceive world,” world, which is not, with the help of the co-possible pre-illustration, pre-memories, the mere mobile, very own field of perception, enters a “bracket” through epoché, becomes a phenomenon, and then is a world phenomenon; but “world in brackets” is a mobile unity of the also bracketed ways of appearance, Ego’s acts, memories, pre-memories, empathies, etc.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Thus indeed I have to say that a world, in advance bracketed in, includes a bracketing in of the human subjectivity correlatively belonging to it and of all actual and possible ways of appearance, like I, as a human I, [492] can have and change my respective concrete world consciousness, also explicating it according to its attendant meanings. The stretch from the beginning of the epoché is the stretch of memory of the modification of world through epoché belonging to the transcendental egological present, that is, [memory] of the current having-in-performance of the having-had of the world phenomenon. As the current world phenomenon has modified through epoché the current perception of the world, thus the past world phenomenon, as the memory of the epoché, has modified past perception. This means: The transcendental memory is modification of the natural-human memory.

The piece of memory of my human world experience and having a world as such together with the human-subjective modes, in which I had accepted past world, back then, goes farther back. By my being in this epoché with regard to the world, my human being , and my human remembering the time stretch of the world, which I can achieve through it, is *eo ipso* bracketed in, and with all psychic-subjective modes, in which I had in all phases this stretch of world time. And of course as well: as I had other people and their lives, their memories, as I was in connection with them by way of empathies and in the taking over of their acceptances with their appearances, etc. had my “idea of the world,” etc.

But in my transcendental present I have as a world phenomenon like my and all other people’s being and human being-in-the-world also my complete objectivating the other, etc. my, the human Ego’s, idea of the world, my whole psychic, constituting the idea of the world as world for me in my subjective modes, with my acts, etc. My memories lie in my purely psychic subjectivity, but also my empathies, everything constituting connection with others, etc., for me. I have this whole with all its components, implications modified as a phenomenon in the epoché. I have all that, which formerly constituted psychic subjectivity for me, in my human continuity of recollection, the **psychic** continuity of memory. This, put into epoché, leads to a modification of memory, which itself is a [493] memory, but a transcendental memory and temporality of memory.

The transcendental necessarily runs parallel to the human memory; because the epoché is simply a concrete modification, which runs in the transcendental-immanent temporality and consists in positing it into the phenomenon by continuously following my worldly temporalization and time. Thereby it is clear: the psychic immanence in its immanent temporality becomes transcendental as a concrete modification in coincidence. Epoché happens continuously; belated recollection of the epoché and therein of the worldly phenomenon is mere reproduction.

The stretch of the current epoché, taken as an epoché in my psychic sphere, in my human-psychic being, is not everything though. I do not indeed perform epoché merely in my humanity and within it with regard to my psychic immanence and to the human idea of the world implied in it. I perform epoché with regard to the world, that is, with regard to the other ones, and not only with regard to my empathy as to my psychic mental livings, like also with regard to my being, in the regard that it shall be objective, as being for all. According to that also my memory of the time prior to the epoché as my human memories and that, which is past therein, has the bracket not only as my current mental livings of memory, and is a phenomenon thus, but the whole past memory life and the remembered past in the natural sense. In the same way all others have their empathies, their memories not only as their psychic life, but as an acceptance of the world, joining in the modification as a phenomenon.

To me, the Ego, all that belongs, all that is subjective, all of the men becoming conscious to me-men. But as an Ego I only have my streaming immanent psychic present in immediate, as immediately streaming modification. That, which I else do have is implied in it as presentiated in the widest sense. The standing-streaming immediate present (or “having been”) of the Ego, or rather, of the Ego pole of the epoché is an immediate modification of the immediate psychic having-been, of that, which is immanent to the human I: This implies presentiations of memory respectively as acceptances of a mediate <kind>, that is, [494] presentiated in acceptance therein the past respectively becoming conscious therein. Changed by the epoché as phenomenon I thus have my pure and simple past.

Furthermore as a phenomenon, as an implied phenomenon or as phenomenon in the secondary sense as a human I, I have my ability, certainty of the I-can. I have my immediate ability, or rather, doing, as directing myself to something immediate, to something. Is the directing myself towards my mental living of memory and thereby “without further ado” to the remembered immediate? As a capability and doing this is not immediate, rather the remembered affects me immediately and I grasp it immediately in an immediate doing, while the mentally living of a memory, the immanent one, is only given to me through a secondary doing of the reflection (by way of a secondary affection).

Mediacy and immediacy of activity, or rather, affectivity, thus differ from the immediacy and mediacy of the “appearing,” as in immanent making present or presentiation, but this is itself already a mere pathway; because my having as a human I is my whole past, my temporality as temporality of memory in the educated, trained capability of the recollection, co-memory, pre-memory.

This enters the epoché in a modified way, on top of that, that, which empathy and the capability based on it add, my capability to follow the expressions of the others in a following and understanding way, at the same time its facultative possibilities to anticipate its acts as well as its trained ability, to behave accordingly, to cognize the other one as understanding this and behaving accordingly, which again is an ability trained according to the general for me and in my understanding for him. And thus communicating with the other one, the one already being for me in this way, I, having myself already acquired and now having my way of being from there in actuality and facultative possibility, I have and he has and all have – all of us having their abilities already for me and respectively for everybody in the community and continuously form them anew – the world in the natural way as the same for all, and respectively appearing for every single one. In this world they themselves as men, as unities of ways of appearance for one another, [495] themselves unities constituted for each other from their acts and acquired abilities.

If world is bracketed in, then all this also enters the phenomenon, my transcendental Ego thus comprises in transcendental modification all that; by immediately coinciding with my immediate whole original psychic immanence, it coincides with all that is implied therein in a mediate way, thus with my own immanent past, in which I, as a standing present I, communicating with the past (memory-like as such) and farther past I, find myself as the continuously One, constituted as one and the same in the time, this time memory, thus also with regard to the pre-memory and with regard to the expected present as one in the ability, which constitutes temporal existence. The way I communicate with me myself, the one constituted by the immanence in this time, I communicate as this one with others through the presentiation of empathy, the others as simply such unities presentiated by me. Thus empathy is similar to memory.

But it needs to be heeded that I, remembering, know myself already as a temporally persisting I, and that I already understand my past being as that of my self I through its duration, which is now a present one at the same time. Likewise concerning empathy and both together: I am already in the world time as a spatiotemporally, persistingly being something of some I and every other one exactly such an I. But the performance is prior to this unity, from which it has gained and has sense, the way it also has continuously taken in a new sense as having already become in continuous performances. I need to perform epoché in different directions, in order to see these performances.

And the universal epoché as “modification”?

[496]

Supplement XXVI:

<Consciousness life prior to and after the epoché>

(January 1935)

One may say:

If I now perform the epoché, then I am in that way “Ego”, and I remain it, as long as I perform the epoché. I remember my being prior to the epoché, in which I was not an “Ego”, I was accepted by me as I, which had accepted world and itself as a man, that is, in some evidence leaving no doubt open. Thus I was a man in the world, and I, the same, am still furthermore a man, simply the one performing this separate epoché now, and nothing is easier than to return from this performance into the life in natural worldliness again.

Or: Being a man is being in the way <of> knowing-oneself-as-a-man and to know oneself as a man living in the world. Thus I am, as often as I say that, conscious without any expression. If I perform epoché, I do not loose this consciousness, I am furthermore certain as a man, I only abstain from the performance of this judgment, or rather, of this acceptance for me, which I then, if I like, may of course actualize again. I never stop being a man, and the epoché is a passing state of my psychic humanity, and everything I cognize therein of purely subjective things – instead of the objective thing, which is refused to me by epoché – these are moments of my psychic humanity, that is, set of states of the epoché.

But then it is mandatory to be careful and to differ true things and wrong things therein in the right way.

Certainly, I am and I remain a man, doubtlessly my epoché is a decision as well, an act and then a habitual attitude of mine, of this man. It may also be, that I, meeting other people in the world, understand them as men, being in the performance of the phenomenological epoché, as I also understand, that a special motivation has caused them to enter from the necessarily first way of its existence, that of the natural worldliness, into that of the epoché – and of course not forever; they will again live straight on and in a worldly interested way. I and we all are men and as that [we are] without any further ado pieces of the world’s content. But to be in the world normally does not necessarily mean to be engaged on the basis of the naturally pregiven world with experienced or otherwise already being accepted objects of the world, which are consciously thematic as that in the subjective life, whereas the consciousness life functioning thereby, simply because [497] it functions, is not thematic. Instead of engaging with that, which is objective for me, I can also engage with my consciousness that is making objective, [can] make it a theme – in the way of “pure” psychology.

I can say all that righteously. But let us consider what the possibility of such a statement presupposes.

1. I am in the epoché, and consequently I experience and I cognize it by consequently stopping, I live a consciousness life and a life of verification, in which no experience, no judgments occur concerning the simply being world, <performed> in an unmodified way, straightforwardly. Instead I have the world as “phenomenon”, and world judgments as “phenomena”, not evident, evident verification processes for judgments, etc., proper ones and foreign ones of foreign people, etc. – all that “bracketed in.”
2. Being in the epoché, I remember, that is, [I remember] that, which belonged to the former phases of the epoché, and this itself, but also my “natural” life, in which I did not perform any epoché. This memory is “transcendental”, it is not the memory I have as a man in the world; every human memory is “bracketed in”, and only as one bracketed in, as a phenomenon for me [it is] in positing. I have my transcendental memory, within the transcendental temporality of memory I have the stretch “epoché” and a stretch of the bracketed in humanity (my humanity) in the bracketed in world, in which I was for myself, living in the world, perceived it as a present one, or rather, in a concrete acceptance of present with a core of my worldly field of perception, related therein through memory and synthesis of memory to my past, to my past world life, my past field of perception, the past recollection from this present, my past abilities to reproduce the past pasts to me, as my abilities as such, the respectively present and past ones. I overview all that in present transcendentality under constant modification of the bracket.
3. My human past prior to the epoché is bracketed in, while I am in the epoché. And furthermore: While I am this, I also have my human present with all my world acceptances, and the world itself being constantly accepted therein in its time modalities: “present, past, future world” (also in its subjective time modalities of the world, being recollectionably, memorially, etc., overviewable, actually experienced and experienceable, and of that transgressing this sphere with the transgressing world time and world temporality) <bracketed in>. This whole is bracketed in.

1. January 16th <1935>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In a natural attitude double attitude as living in the world: 1) to **us** as performer of the universal world consciousness – as subjects for the world; 2) **to the world** and therein to us as something being in the world, as something real in it. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Page 481,5-486,29 of the German edition – editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Is all this not a matter of course for every modification of intention, just that we have a universality here? [↑](#footnote-ref-4)