No. 13

<The concreteness of the transcendental subjectivity as transcendental person>

(Autumn 1930, Chiavari)

1. „I“ in the natural sense, as this human person living in the world and thus finding me. The world, to which I belong myself, my [horizon of] existence, my horizon of self-preservation.
2. I, changing into phenomenological change of focus, the transcendental one, gain as thematic horizon of experience my concrete transcendental subjectivity, my transcendental Ego-subject (the pole) as a center, as substrate of the concrete totality of my abilities, as center of my current conscious life, lying within my ability, or rather, of my current themes, lying within my ability, including my worldly themes and my natural world as world of my naturally habitual life. Natural existence within the synthetic performance of the heretofore hidden (constituting the Ego of naturalness as unity of manifoldness) life is then an abstract layer in the concretion of transcendental subjectivity. Natural life-form is then cognized as a limited form, in which the Ego actualizes its abilities in preformed habitualities, and thus actively executes an egoical existence, a way of self-preservation, or rather, of striving for self-preservation, not reckoning a higher, richer manifoldness of possibilities, and in any case does not develop self-preservation in express regard to the totality of all abilities.

We need to remark here: If the transcendental epoché sets in and transcendentally experiencing reflection within it, and uncovers the being and life constituting naturalness, heretofore having remained anonymous in the naturalness of existence, then transcendental subjectivity has not been uncovered in total concretion. The new, already transcendental sphere of experience itself has again its horizon of the subjective constituting it in a transcendental way, a higher anonymous and transcendental horizon. For the now possible uncovering of [199] the same obviously the same is accepted, and thus iteratively. Only through the ability of the transcendental Ego, the ability to become conscious of this iteration in its infinity, to overview it unitarily in the and-so-on, on top of that, to apprehend and to fixate the essential form of this infinity within the ability – and of course also the ability to be able to produce the same performance within the ever-again also for this performance within reflection, etc. -, only thereby I gain my completely concrete transcendental subjectivity as a horizon, as a horizon thus not of some transcendental reflection to be performed in one single step, but in iterative reflection, experientially becoming certain of the possibility of iteration with its essential form in the and-so-on and ever-again, or in the form of a horizon of endless reflection, ever again possible into infinity. I am thereby for myself ever again a horizon pre-designed in advance, and ever again certain as one, determined in itself, and experienceable in its determinability within actual reflection, and explicable in its specialties.

1. I and other ones within natural attitude: I, the man, and other men, ranging in the generative connection of the world, which is my world of experience. Transcendental “interpretation” of my natural world includes the transcendental interpretation of this whole generative connection, of the whole inter-personal connection and its unity-form, the history of men. The transcendental interpretation of birth and death belongs here. All questions and answers, related to the world of natural experience, of natural human existence, thus also all sciences related to this world are subject to transcendental interpretation, the reduction to its transcendental sense. They need to be explored under the aspect of radical and most general cognition of essences that world as such is an index for a limited sphere of transcendental possibilities within transcendental subjectivity being solely concrete and absolutely self-sufficient. In advance it is soon to be seen that a transcendental Ego, or rather, some irrelatively concrete transcendental subjectivity corresponds to every human [Ego], and to the allness of men within the unity of their generative connection the [200] all-encompassing transcendental subjectivity, being still more concrete than a single transcendental subject, if the interpretation shows that essential grounds demand the interrelatedness of transcendental single subjects. The big problem here of the necessary backward relation of all transcendental subjects, being accessible from me, to myself, and of the necessity that all being for me, that is accessible to me, are all, which simply are able to have a sense for me, etc.

I, the man in the world, naturally living in a human way only as this man and in personal attitude finding myself as this human person, am not another Ego afterwards, as which I find myself in transcendental attitude. However, some ambiguity of speaking does play [sic!] here, having its essential grounds though. According to the above said, I find myself naturally living and with a personal attitude exclusively within my persisting personal being, i.e. as something identical of my personal characteristics (as a substrate of my personal characteristics, my strict habits, my habitual directions of interest, of the style of my striving for self-preservation, of my characteristics related to that, etc.) I thereby apprehend myself within my habitually limited abilities, in my habitual world horizon, in all my actualities. Insofar, this Ego is not the transcendental one, I do not know anything of the transcendental within my limited self-apperception.

But the transcendental Ego, concretely understood as transcendental subjectivity, is simply the uncovered concretion, encompassing the natural human subject and therein the human person in its abstraction, and having made it visible through transcendental reduction within this concretion. The transcendental Ego as a pole and as a substrate of the allness of abilities so to say is the transcendental person, arriving at primal institution through phenomenological reduction, who, entering the universality of the concrete transcendental, acquires the completely encompassing life bringing into the game all abilities, and may bring to formation of all modes of practicing self-preservation now. It is shown in so doing that the naturally personal being and life is only a transcendental part-form of the [201] life still remaining identical in all other possible changes, namely of the same actual and possible unity of life, centered by the same Ego pole, identical in all of these possible changes. Only that this Ego pole, limiting itself to different spheres of self-preservations, thereby acquires different “personal” characters, which are all though internally connected in a way to be explored.

[202]

No. 14

<On the structure of the interest field and the consciousness. The inhibiting of the world interest. The reduction uncovers the absolute concrete Ego of all possibilities of life>

(End of October until the middle of November 1930, Chiavari)

*<Contents from page 207, 18 on:> Beginning within the natural attitude, the world-experiencing one. I always have a universal complete field of experience, from which the respectively apprehended is singled out and seized. Consciousness of the thematizing consciousness, of the consciousness as such. The uncovering reflection. Fundamental structures of the consciousness, or rather, of the consciousness as such. Always core of an experiencing (self-giving) consciousness, therein self-consciousness as self-experience. The thematizing Ego, the interested one. Always a field of interests. <P.> V >page 213, 21> ff. Self-contained themes – universal structure of the temporalization. Stream of consciousness and temporalized field of experience, thematically experiencing Ego. The perveived. Experience in the pregnant sense within the total field of experience, <p.> VI <page 215, 5> especially the area of the interest, world as universal field of interest. The Ego of the interest, correlate: being world. Modalization and unity with oneself. Reflection, universal reflection of experience, and universal as such. Ways of appearance of the experienced, universally: world in manifold ways of appearance (world as correlate of the Ego of interests). <P.> IX <page 219,23> transition to the epoché and phenomenological reflection. The inhibiting of the world interest. The Ego of the universal epoché with regard to the totality of the worldly interests. Natural and transcendental Ego, natural and transcendental science – phenomenology.*

[203]

<§ 1.> A piece of clarification of the change in attitude of the epoché in its first introduction[[1]](#footnote-1)

I now perform, by changing my focus phenomenologically, “epoché”, i.e., I assume a radically new direction towards a new thematic universe, which for its part, and in contrast to the natural one, shall be clarified and described, instead of the “natural attitude” as a certain thematic direction (reflectively first of all to be exactly clarified and described by me), hitherto exclusively exercised by me. The difference of my thematically habitual directedness is in advance and quite at the first place named by the words: “the world” has been my thematic universe up till now, everything I had thematic in specialty, towards which I was directed respectively, was something real (real things, real characteristics, real facts, real whole things or parts, etc.) something spatiotemporally being, and as that united, co-existing in the widest sense within the unity of the real world as the spatiotemporal universe always being for me.

As having a natural worldly attitude I have also been directed towards “idealities”, and these were thematic singularities of “ideal worlds” for me (e.g. numbers in the world of numbers), but these idealities of my naturally focused Ego life still were idealities (irrealities) “with relation to” worldly realities, were “according to their scope” related to the world in their sense of being. A hint suffices to say what this means here for the time being that wherever I had numbers and relations of numbers as my theme, for example as a pure arithmetician – as “ideal objects” I was occupied with, I was “directed” to -, the sense of these “unities” remaining indeterminately variable was nothing else but “something else” to be particularized in what way ever, but in such a way that “something” meant something real, worldly (temporal being); thus “things” (real substrates) where considered as counted (and nothing else could ever come into my mind in this attitude), objective determinations, objective pluralities or pluralities of such [204] determinations, etc. As to the radical thematic change of focus now, generated through the phenomenological epoché – epoché with regard to the being-for-me of something worldly as such –, it is hinted at by the expression: The universal theme “world” changes itself into the universal theme “world phenomenon”.

Let us try to clarify the essence of this change in attitude in a deeper way. Let us try to extricate the evidence that this change in attitude is an actual performance to be performed in our freedom, that actually two universal and correlative thematic universes, as two correlative spheres of being, <present themselves>. The systematically proceeding clarification in its constant succeeding is itself nothing else but the systematically produced evidence.

To be in “natural attitude”, that is being engaged in the awake living along, thus being busy with this or that. We exit this busyness in a reflecting way, the being-directed towards this or that in the widest sense, being-busy at or with that, and we find us simply there as being busy, active, directed in such and such a way, and the Whereto of this directedness simply as such. We find it as something being in the common sense, i.e. as a spatiotemporal being in respective subjective modes of temporalization as something present for us, as something past or coming in future; we find it, as has already been said, within a universal horizon of the spatiotemporality’s all-encompassing form of being. Concerning us ourselves, and at first concerning me myself, practicing this reflection there, I find myself as something spatiotemporally real, as I, the worldly occupied man, and belonging myself to the world as something spatiotemporally being.

Here we need to stress above all, in repeated annexation to the already said: Thus living as a man, as a human Ego in the world, living into the world, is, to which I am directed respectively, being for me (in certainty or in a modality of certainty) in one of the subjectively temporal modes: being present, having been present to me or coming in future (which more closely distinguishable time modes may come into question hereby ever, by the way). But not only that. Something worldly is not only conscious to me in time modes, but I always and necessarily [205] have conscious world in primary temporalization as an awake Ego, namely a continuous stream of “immediate experience”, the world experience, always and necessarily runs through my awake world life. Every non-experiencing consciousness-of some worldly thing (on a higher step then of course that of the idealities worldly related in their sense) is sensefully related back to them in a certain way, which certainly is much in need of some closer investigation and interpretation. Suffices the indication that a not intuitable, that is, anyway, every non-experiencing consciousness of as well has to legitimate itself according to its actual being and being thus, or rather, to clarify itself through the “going back to the respective experience”.

It is experience, in which that, which is for us, is conscious to us as itself in its actuality, and else not only world as such is conscious to me in my awake life, but conscious to me as originally there for me, as immediately experienced, as immediately perceived, as immediately, the way it was, remembered – which certainly soon refers to the steps of the immediacy, to differences of primary and proper immediacy and secondary mediacy, as that of the experiencing presentiations. Meanwhile, the clarifying process requires the progress of raw, nearest exhibitions towards more subtle ones, from immediacies in a first rough sense towards immediacies in a relative sense, still showing themselves the essential character of the immediacy of seizing upon something itself and having something itself in an experiencing way, disregarding their foundation.

If we now keep in mind this basic fact, expressed in the words: “I am continuously an experiencing subject as a naturally awake Ego”, then this basic fact is richer in curiosities, than it first wishes to appear, curiosities I do not remark when living along in a natural way, experiencing along, but which soon open up to my view, as soon as I go over from naturally straight experiencing towards a reflective experience [206] and consideration of this experiencing, and from there freely proceed in a reflective way.[[2]](#footnote-2)

<§ 2.> First world experience: Attitude towards singularity.

Second: towards the worldly universe

“I experience the world all the time”, insofar as I am an awake Ego as such, a currently living one in a natural way in world consciousness, a worldly active Ego. But this expression, considered more closely, is an ambiguous one, an expression for different thematic attitudes still belonging together in a senseful way, simply under this title “I am an awake Ego, naturally living the world”. These different attitudes are freely possible ones for me respectively, which I may pursue any time from those I am respectively using right now. But this happens in such a way that they all derive from and point back in their own sense to some original attitude, some basic attitude. This is thus distinguished as the first in itself, founding all other possible ones. These may only enter essentially for their part as variants (as “intentional modifications”, as we will explain later) of the basic attitude. It is namely clear that for all experiencing being-busy or being-directed the first in itself is that experiencing, in which I, the experiencing subject, am directed towards this or that worldly single thing, towards this or that object, towards any determination, towards this or that fact, etc. That is the natural living-in-the-world in the first and naturally first sense. Only through the change of this basic attitude may I direct myself to the world as such (the universe), towards singularities as singularities of this universe or towards abstractively-universal layers of this universe, for example towards the universal space, towards the form of the universal succession of the worldly being as such or also towards the universe of merely physical nature, etc.

[207] We need to talk of all this, to clarify it within the natural world life and to descriptively interpret it. But now our attention shall be directed towards some mostly fundamental differentiation between the basic attitude and a modified position, belonging to the natural world experience in the most general and most radical way, and belonging to it since world experience is consciousness of the world in the original mode of original seizing upon something itself and having something itself, and since this consciousness, the one experiencing the world, is essentially constituted in mediations, which are gained for the experiencing subject within some basic attitude and variants of this basic attitude.

It will become clearer immediately, what is meant here, if we take heed that the world experience, which continuously carries the world consciousness of the awake Ego, first of all is a continuous world perception.[[3]](#footnote-3)

<§ 3. Foundational structures of the consciousness as self-consciousness>[[4]](#footnote-4)

I practice the epoché – I am in the attitude of the experiencing thereby[[5]](#footnote-5), that is, of the experiencing in the common sense of the directedness towards something intuitively given itself, within itself or being-busy with it itself. Experiencing in this sense is inseparably one with some experiencing in a wider sense, the “thematic” experiencing (thus the perceiving being-directed-towards-some-perceptually-present-appearing-thing) is essentially an experiencing on the basis of an unthematic, farther reaching experiencing. Spoken in a correlative way: Thematically (e.g. in a perceiving, apprehending, explicating way) being occupied with something intuitive [208], not only this alone is intuitive for me myself (originally appearing as original present or as originally self-presenting past). Consciously I have a whole field of experience, from which the experienced thing in the distinguished, the thematic sense is singled out and seized, has become aware. It is conscious as a whole, it is unitarily intuitive in the mode of self-appearance. But I, my active, my interested Ego, the Ego of the active directedness and however more closely being busy on its own accord, is simply only turned to this being distinguished in the total field. A stimulus, some affection is shining from it, the passively pregiven to me, following which I “look at”, apprehend, act.

Obviously something similar holds not only true for the experiencing consciousness of and with regard to the difference between thematically being active in something and being busy with it in contrast to the unthematic “background”. Each thematic consciousness of something, also the not experiencing one, has its encompassing total background, its total field of consciousness, from which the affections come. But why do we know of all of that, is it possibly a speculative construction? Nothing less than that.[[6]](#footnote-6)

It is obvious indeed: When we are thematically busy with something, we are able to again reflect on this being-busy itself, <we may> pay attention to it, turn to it, make it a theme for its part.[[7]](#footnote-7) And likewise, when we, occupied with some business, are otherwise affected by something taking place thereby, then we are conscious of all taking place thereby. More concisely: I, the subject consciously living along, the thematizing, affected subject, am myself again conscious of the thematic consciousness, of the unthematic being affected, of the whole consciousness process in its twists and turns. This consciousness of a higher step is again first an unthematic one, which I may though thematize within my ability of “reflection” according to its unthematic contents; I may direct myself towards it, e.g. apprehend it, look at it, explicate, I may “afterwards” [209] become aware in special regard that affections hit me, my active Ego, but [that] I did not follow them, or did not follow them “immediately”, what may again have its different modes to be remarked. Etc.

This holds ever again true and is accepted of some new thing for every step of the reflection; each is a unitary one and thus <related> to a field of manifold [kinds of] consciousness-of as such, conscious appearing, conscious in the change of appearing, of the objectivating and presenting consciously in such and such a way as the same becoming conscious: The “wonder” of consciousness,[[8]](#footnote-8) the wonder of all wonders, seemingly an unconceivable countersense; because the “I am”, the living as an awake Ego, as the being busy with something, and with ever again new things, thereby related to a field of the already unthematically being for me, is uncovered as being in endless regress.

To live consciously is not as simply being so to say a being field, and related to that as an Ego, as a point, from which Ego acts are emitted, making thematic this or that of this field, and at the same time being an Ego of abilities, center of abilities, of manifold ways of being able to occupy oneself, to thematize. Rather, living as an Ego is being conscious of oneself and of one’s life as well as of one’s abilities, one’s faculties, is always being conscious at the same time of one’s respective consciousness, is thus at the same time potentiality of ever new reflection, faculty to <be able> to go back from a respective field of consciousness to the consciousness of this field, from (with regard to activity) a respective thematizing to the consciousness of thematizing (with all that, which is inseparable of it). That, which this rising reflection finds, is always already there in advance for the Ego. Also the active directing oneself and being directed, although only springing through activity from the Ego pole, is conscious in advance, is already conscious in the springing, and that, before it affects, and may and does become reflectively thematic. Some infinity of ever new reflection is possible and that, which it constitutes, needed to already “appear” consciously, in order to be able to be constituted.

[210]

<§ 4.> On the uncovering reflection, that is, doxic reflection

Steps of the total consciousness of, in which a total horizon of consciousness is the conscious thing, which is a horizon for its part, an endless field for possibilities (better abilities) of my Ego, to practice thematic apprehensions therein, to ever again occupy myself anew within the field from them, in the play of affective, stronger or lesser effective tendencies.

I may surpass this field of consciousness ever again in a reflective way, and I do this as soon as I direct myself from the respective thematic and from the corresponding specifically thematic syntheses to that consciousness in a reflective way, in which the thematizing from the unthematic field of consciousness, its variants, its syntheses for me are conscious to me, even if unthematically. Ever again consciousness is in that, in which something is conscious, not a mere having of something, but itself a manifold realm, in the interplay of which (play of consciousness, intentional constitution) and according to essential ways of performance of intentional syntheses, something conscious is constituted as what it respectively is for me, thematic in its horizon, etc. It is an essentially necessary unity of ways of consciousness changing in a manifold way, unifying in certain forms, which, ever again reflectively apprehended as a unity, as performing and in a certain way seen with regard to the How of their performance, are apprehended and perceived in a reflectively thematic way. Ever again: Because every reflection leads from a field of consciousness, in which the respective being busy of the Ego has its thematic field, to something new, to simply this being busy.

But that, which is exhibited here, is as an exhibited most original certainty, is an evident givenness prior to all theory, encompassed in the apodictic certainty of the I-am, nothing else but its interpretation. A rough interpretation though, first of all, but already as that a steadfast certainty. It is thus clear in advance that the regress is not a countersense; to rise in the ever again new reflection is a unity of some rising in the unity of an intuition, its hierarchical formation, its ways of consciousness, offering new and new steps, that is, in the unity of an evidently [211] concordant being, inseparably correlated – the most extreme contrast to every (even logical) countersense.

But the wonder of consciousness that consciousness is essentially within the self-consciousness, which proceeds, essentially proceeding as consciousness-of-something, as consciousness of simply this consciousness itself, is further uncovered to us and shows a most fundamental structural peculiarity, insofar as we simply link to the evidence, in which we, in which the Ego of consciousness experiences consciousness in its original selfness in a reflective and ever again reflective way. The awake Ego always has its realm of the respectively being for it and as a respective field, in which it is active, its field of consciousness in the thereby designated determinate sense (in contrast to the consciousness of this consciousness, which only when it affects opens up a field of consciousness for it, a filed of reflective occupations).

But not all that is conscious is conscious in an experiencing way, a field of consciousness is not necessarily a field of experience, is not a field of that, which is conscious in the mode of “itself”. It is, as precise examinations need to show, not enough to differ between intuitive and unintuitive consciousness-of or being conscious. Intuitiveness has different more simple and more complex shapes. Experiencing intuiting, having intuitive as something experienced designates a proper essentially connected way of intuitive consciousness of, being relatively immediate, the general character of which is designated by the intuitive being conscious as itself, as originally intuitive (that is, for example not as an analogizing image, as making intuitive something not intuited by oneself) and is for the Ego, is accepted as being in any modality of certainty. This way of intuitiveness has its changing modes, modes of some certain relativity, that is, mediacy in the originality. Thus most of all the mode of perception stands out as consciousness of the past (past present) as itself, as a past being originally presenting itself. If the intuition is thematic then the active Ego is itself at that, which originally presents itself to it in a special sense, or in the occupation with memorized things at that, which presents itself to it as its past and simply as itself.

We need to remark here generally and basically:

Awake consciousness life is, although consciousness does in no way need to consciously be being in an experiencing way, yet always experiencing life. Necessarily the Ego has in every total phase of its life conscious a unitary field of experience in the unity of total experience. According to our above indicated differentiation we may say more precisely: A total consciousness of experience “goes through” the total consciousness, in the sense of the whole consciousness, which opens up on all steps of reflection, which ever again need to be renewed (what ever may characterize this transition more closely). Furthermore, not every field of consciousness is an experiencing one in the special sense of a field, in which the originally active Ego moves in its occupations, and still, each is carried by a unity of experience.[[9]](#footnote-9) Experience is always and within a self-contained totality there as well, may this experience be unthematic and not a field of thematic interest, a field, which is a realm of unitary affection in that special way, in which, as a pregiven one, the Ego keeps itself in a thematizing way.

The consciousness life is not merely, but still always in different modes (thus in the important, just indicated ones) experiencing life. The Ego has self-consciousness, this implies: It always has self-experience, and is that, which it is, only as being in self-experience. This relates to its own being and consciousness of; but it also has experiencing consciousness of such things it is not itself as an Ego, and as a consciously living one.

But while it experiences, and experiences what ever – whether something peculiar or foreign to it in the special sense -, always and necessarily the experiencing is the unity of a field of experience as a field of some possible themes, and always the experiencing is itself, as consciousness of the experiencing consciousness, experiencing for its part, for its part conscious as originally appearing – although [213] in no way necessarily constituted as unity of a decisive field of occupation, a field of experience, as a consciously constituted realm for respectively connected themes. We may also say: Not all experientially conscious things or even the totality of experience always belonging to the living existence, is a field of interest, a field, the Ego, being interested, directed to, acting in a striving way, progressing from action to action in unitary interest, and combining its performances, is focused to, in which it actualizes its being interested in a moving way.

<§ 5. Consciousness as time stream. Analysis of the interest>

Let us withdraw in this first course of exhibiting universal basic structures of the awake consciousness life the questions on the essential relatedness of the not experiencing consciousness to the experiencing one – making up an enormous field of higher level research on the consciousness – and let us consider the universality of experiencing, which above all needs to uncover its structures.

Here the fundamental sentence needs to be pronounced: Experiencing is temporalizing.

The wonder of consciousness leads back to the wonder of temporalization, to the original fact that the consciousness life – of the awake, somehow active Ego – is a stream of consciousness and is conscious as streaming consciousness. This “streaming” is thus, as the picture suggests, a continuous variation, in which every phase is consciousness. That, which is conscious in this streaming consciousness, has no continuous intuitiveness according to the above said, but anyway a unitarily intuitive thing, that is, the field of experience, is conscious. Thus the streaming life being in continuous change is constantly a unitarily experiencing one, in which the experienced is a unitary field of experience.

Let us now think back to the previously said, in which we spoke about the general structure of the consciousness life as its self-conscious stream of consciousness and Ego stream. It is [214] more closely determined in the latter explanation by this stream being at the same time a stream of experience in every phase, a stream of temporalization; that, which is temporalized, is a field of experience, and this means: a field of temporal being. A temporal field is conscious to the Ego of consciousness (as something thematically conscious to it, whether thematic or not) in every phase of its streaming life, which is a unitary consciousness-of in a streaming way, that is, in the mode it itself, in that of experience.

Thereby everything is determined more closely now, which we said more generally before, how some original knowledge may properly derive from experience at first, simply because experience is the original structure in advance, in which consciousness life is not only as such and all the time, but originally enlightens for itself and then is apprehensible through the ability of thematizing for the Ego in its selfness.

The particularity of the generally above said by taking into view the experiential structure going through, more closely happens in the following way:

The Ego, the pure consciousness Ego of the epoché, is a continuously experiencing Ego in the streaming, the stream of consciousness is a constantly experiencing stream, the Ego is related to some experiential field in every phase of its life, to an open (limitless) realm, which still needs to be described more closely, of the being for it as appearing to it in the mode of the it itself, and this realm has the essential form of the temporal being.

On the other hand though we need to think of the essential difference constantly functioning as well between being experienced in a thematic and unthematic way. The Ego has its respective field of experience in the double form of the temporal field given to it, into which it lives in a specific sense in a perceiving and otherwise thematically experiencing way, grasping and seizing this and that from it, and occupying with that, and this within the constant consciousness of faculty of being able to continue thematizing in this field, the field of its respectively reigning interest. But reigning interest, this means here structurally: Awake Ego is essential within an interest, essentially related to a realm of pregiven temporal being (or easier, to a realm of some things being for it), to be active therein, for example to become affected [215], to direct itself aiming at the affecting, to acquire it, to actualize it by striving towards, aiming at it, and to thereby fulfill its special interest, the component of the total interest, unseparated within itself.

<§ 6.> The Ego in the interest. Field of interest, Ego of interest

As Ego of interest (= awake Ego) it is not only one mere point of emission of contingent acts, breaking forth from it without any connection, as obviously it neither is merely a point of emission of contingent “stimuli”, contingently aiming at it. It is an Ego in advance under all circumstances, which already has its field of interest as pregiven to it. To live in an egoical way, being interested, busy and proceeding from busyness to busyness, that is already having a field of interest, and proceeding therein from current special interest to a current one, living into this field in unitariness already predelineating its structure.

Of course the further question is, what makes up this unitariness, or, which is the same, what makes up the Ego as living in a unitary way and thus keeping itself in a field, therein satisfying itself, as an Ego of interest, and what makes up the synthetic connection of all acts, carried by the unity of a field of interest, how such acts essentially combine to acts of a higher order, that is, according to interests of a higher order, how the Ego gains at first its field of experience in the striving for identity of the being in the manifold living into its consciousness field, or, which is the same, concordance in the striving for self-perseverance, how the accordance, the being-united-with-oneself-as-an-Ego-of-interest though may be inhibited, how modalization and some higher concordance may grow through modalization, and thus the Ego may arrive from un-unitariness with itself at unitariness, from dissatisfaction at satisfaction.

All these are issues of a higher level. We are standing at the preconditioning structures here, founding all these processes of the specific Ego-striving and Ego-life. And there it was simply [216] the first in itself, to limit the vague talking of consciousness life and therein of experience life through the showing of structures sinking deeper in, to exhibit the constant relatedness of the Ego to its respective experience field as a field of possible affections, themes lying within one’s ability, or, which is the same, the basic fact that awake life is an active life, but as that always already in advance living into a field of experience, into a sphere of being, spoken in vague generality, into a “world”, and at first one, consciously presenting itself.

World, pregiven field of possible (egoically lying within one’s ability) activities is not something, which has entered the Ego’s realm θύραθεν, but springing as a unity of the being-sense in the experiential structure of the Ego and from the whole of its experiencing life itself, as which alone may be there from such inner sources for the Ego, simply as that, which affects it, as what it turns to, as which it is busy with.

And thus it is necessary now to perform a turn of the view from the field of experience and from its respective themes, the respective ones, consciously determining the Ego, occupying it, towards the experiencing himself.

We thus reflect on the streaming consciousness, in which the originally presenting itself of something temporally being comes about. Thus for example the Ego, conscious in the “naturalness” of its life as a human one, as its field of interest, and at first its field of experience, constantly being for it, world of experience pregiven to it, in the world in the common sense, in the spatiotemporal world and only in this one, as long as it simply lives in the way of naturally human life, acts in a “naturally” worldly way, is life, human life. The spatiotemporal universe is the all of that, which is for me, affects me, determines me in all activities, in all efforts, cares, in my theoretical or untheoretical purposes, aimings, as long as I live along in naturalness.

To preserve myself is there to preserve myself as living into, being interested into, worrying into, and acting into this world, to wish to come and possibly come to the unit of a univocal existence, or, which is the same, satisfying my unitary human Ego of interest. Thus I am [217] a humanly experiencing subject, and experiencing myself as a man in the spatiotemporal universe of experience, all my striving and living keeps itself in the continuously pregiven universe of experience of the spatiotemporal world.

But now we divert our view from this world of experience, and thereby direct, while inhibiting the universal interest of naturally worldly life, our view to the world experiencing, that is, to the streamingly experiencing life. The experiencing itself is not itself thematic as related to the experiencing of my world in an experiencing way. Meanwhile, this being unthematic is not the essential thing here. The world as well as a universal life-field, as the universe of my worldly abilities and activities, is not thematic in the worldly life; simply that is thematic, which I regard, which I get to know, which I wish to use, which I wish to create for me in this or that way, etc.

The being-a-universal-field-of-experience-for-me means, as reflection teaches immediately, that “the” (spatiotemporal) world “appears”, presents itself as a continuous unity in the manifoldness streamingly going one into the other, and synthetically unifying. It presents itself – the same things encompassed within it -, but in a continuously streaming presenting-oneself in ever new ways of appearance, in ever new ways of self-presentation, always differing from one another, and yet in the stream of these differences creating the consciousness of the respective same thing. And that, which holds true for the single thing of the world seized and picked out, holds true for the world itself, which is experienced as a universe of the spatiotemporal being as an identical *totum*, built up from nothing but identical things, and, as in the single thing, thus <in> the total “unity of manifoldness”, more exactly synthetic unity of changing universal self-presentations, streaming one into the other.

We so to say naively live through the streaming manifoldness of experiencing appearances in being straightforwardly related to the world (in a worldly attitude) and thereby specifically directed now to this, now to that single thing, and possibly in reflection on the encompassing *totum*, to the world itself, and in thematizing something worldly we direct the progress of this manifoldness, while we are not at all directed to it, while we did not at all [218] had the universe of our streaming experiencing life as our field of experience, our spheres of interest instead of the world or at the same time with the world in the universal field of interest.

Facing the world field, facing the interest field constituted in advance we thus have a realm of the world constituting consciousness, that of the manifold self-presentations of the world in its own synthetic unity, and this realm is for us as presenting itself at the same time and always. Thus also the stream of world experience is experienced in a certain sense, while the world is experienced. We meet the deepest difficulties of phenomenological description here, differences of experience and experience field, difficult to be grasped.

Living along in natural attitude (prior to the epoché) I do not know anything but the world, all interests are worldly interests, all experiencing apprehensions and activities performed in the experiencing are worldly bound. The world, the one and only spatiotemporal universe is always <pregiven> to me, the naturally living one, spread in front of me, and nothing else, pregiven as unitarily presenting itself, as universal experience field, that as universal horizon of my current and possible interests, as we cannot stress often enough, has its unity in advance, the unity simply of a universe, into which I live, being a correlate of my Ego as natural Ego, as living in the unity of a direction of interest in advance, implying all my special interests in advance, that is, conscious to me in advance as that, the realm of my reign, the realm of my cares, etc.: mine, as the one I am, am a man, being within the world itself and in a worldly and only worldly attitude. Issues sinking deep derive from here concerning the further clarification of these structural unities “natural interest Ego” and “natural world, universal interest field”.

The universal unity World as unity of the pregiven universal interest field, all natural abilitites, natural strivings, experiences, feelings, willings, wishes, cares, bothers, actions are included in, has many specialties, special realities as title for the Ego’s special interests, special experiences, special activities; and these specialties [219] in many contexts, in many syntheses of interest and the world have their forms, their layers of being, have special universes of possible interest, implicitly pregiven ones within the universal pregivenness.

It is our task to get to know the natural world structurally and to thereby master the special and biggest difficulty descriptively, that the Ego, having a worldly attitude, lives a world life, has world as a total interest horizon, and still finds itself as a worldly, as a spatiotemporal being and in natural attitude to its “subjective thing”, to its experiencing, to its ways of appearance of some experienced real thing, also to its being affected, its turning to, making a business and occupying oneself, now also finds all this subjective as being in the world, fits [it] into the experienced world under the title “something psychic” of the bodily-psychic man. And again: the Ego in its worldly performances, as fulfilling its interests in its activities, and thereby actualizing through activity these or those results, finds, as does its subjectively streaming consciousness of and [its] consciously performing, thus the results <being> performed, and formations with all their peculiarities in the world pointing back to something subjective, in one and the same totally pregiven universality of experience.

And yet all the world, the all of the “being” for me as a natural Ego, is not everything, while it is not at all and may not be thus on the other side, as if my world was only a piece of an encompassing whole, the supplemental piece of which has only been overseen for example, has not been taken into account from which reasons ever.

<§ 7. Natural and phenomenological reflection. The epoché as phenomenological reduction to the absolute Ego of all possibilities of being>

With a leap onto phenomenological ground we have seized the transcendentally phenomenological ground, a leap of reflection, having an incomparably peculiar character as through the “epoché”, with regard to all pregiven worldliness. [220] What do I want from the epoché, what shall and does it actually perform? I, the worldly living one, prevent the interest dominating in this “natural attitude”, the interest focusing me as a worldly interested Ego and organizing me in all my affections and actions – the universal interest, the correlate of which is my universal interest field, my world, in my naturalness “the” world pure and simple. I prevent it, this may not mean, I am now absolutely without any interest by simply killing my former universal interest, that of living into my former universal interest field. Performing the epoché I further say indeed: I am, I, the now abnegating the straightforwardly living into the world, am, and [I] am the same, who had just been worldly interested and now is inhibiting the world interest.

I am: I have in advance as an Ego, I have at first pregiven my world field, I am in the interest, and [I] am only as an Ego in this relation to my interest field, I am I as the same in the manifoldness of special directions of the interest (affections, stimuli), special actualizations of the interest (thematic acts, active directions, activities). But I am not only the same by my taking on affections (modes of interest), activating, or else, which is a general mode of activity in progress, for example abstaining temporally, inhibiting the actualization, or letting it “fall”, being “deviated” through more effective affections. All that within the unity of my world interest, or rather, of the universal experience field pregiven to me. I am still the same in the “investigating my sense”: universally and not <by my> inhibiting the respectively already thematic thing within the pregiven, preaccepted world in a partially sense-investigative way. Every thematic act is actualization of interest, and implies its mode of acceptance, the acceptance as being there in certainty or probability or as otherwise possible for me and possible in practical certainty, as a wished for practical goal, etc.

I may get above in a sense investigative way instead of activating straightforwardly, having accepted straightforwardly and bringing about acceptance, take on a new position in a new, modifying act (presupposing the former one as “naively” performed), in [221] which I am above the acceptance or non-acceptance, above every naïve position taking, like in the way of the non-participant onlooker of this previous naivety, being further conscious, presupposed for the change of focus. But that not only within the interest field always being accepted by me, although not explicitly [being] thematic, that is, not as the natural Ego, being continuously conscious of its spatiotemporal world currently as a realm of its natural existence, its universal experience field as that, in which it lives in an interested way, in which it is in the common sense (is as an Ego), and has to be.

What does this new attitude of the Ego above all acceptance of the world signify, how shall I make it come to pass? Let us consider:

The universally experiencing consciousness, in which I have conscious this world (my natural being all), and as something appearing itself, has, as little as it is noticeable for me in the naturalness of the living along (and as little as it is the mere sum or synthesis of the chain of thematic acts), its existence, unitary in itself, although hidden so to say, and it is thus, that it creates unity of some universal acceptance for the totality of that, which is unthematically or thematically experienced in it. The world is a universal unit of the being for me, of the accepted by me, as ready for habits, for activities of any kind (as to be performed in a univocal way).

Now I (and this as a possibility belongs to me as the Ego) may reflect on my world in its totality. That, which I find in this universal experiencing reflection is not the sum of real singularities, those being for me right now in a conspicuous way, in the unity of some synthetically linked thematic – like a burning group of houses with the turmoil of men being busy by that – or likewise in remembrance: Those forming a thematic unity of remembrance as having been for me recently; instead I find the universal world horizon as my theme[[10]](#footnote-10), respectively implying such things in a thematic way, but still is its horizon beyond, horizon of “possible experiences”, manifold abilities of the [222] themes, in its way given to me myself (experienced), being in its way with this sense for me, being accepted universally by me as a field of being of my possible affection and actions lying within my ability. <Re>flecting in this way, I apprehend the world in its universal acceptance of experience as a world in a special thematic way of experience, an already founded one.

<§ 8.> Epoché <with regard to the universal theme world>

But now I, simply the same Ego, formerly living in naturalness, may put this world, being accepted in advance (we often said, this “pregiven” one) “out of the action”, i.e., I may inhibit this unitary acceptance, universal in advance, by which it [the world] is, or rather was for me continuously, and thus was my Ego of interests, [I may] for example consider it as a “mere phenomenon” in some universally directed sense investigativeness. If I do that, then I already reflect on the experiencing life and on me as the subject of performance of this life of acceptance. I may thereby proceedingly make the universal consciousness life, in which world is accepted by me, and above all the universal experiencing life, simply my new universal theme, my new field of interest, and in one, correlatively to that, the world itself as the one experienced in this universal experiencing, purely as that.

One thus sees the fundamental difference between the different possible reflections, radically differentiating all reflections to be performed in the unity of world experience being naturally performed and remaining in constant performance within it, and the “transcendentally-phenomenological” reflection, in which no world is naturally pregiven, that is, in acceptance as universal ground for all – natural – acceptances of being.

It may be that the performance of this difference of reflections causes big difficulties, but we need to acquire it through and through. On the one side natural reflection: I may reflect on the world, and reflect on it as my universal field of being and experience; I then find myself as a man among the worldly being things, to which all my psychic acts, thus including all my world experiencing ones, [223] belong.[[11]](#footnote-11) In the naturalness I say: The world is given for me as a unity of my manifold actual and possible experiencing mental livings, field of my possible interests, etc., and all these mental livings, all my stimuli hitting me from this world, all my experiencing and other activities are worldly occurrences themselves. All this changes its sense in phenomenological reflection, I may not speak thus any more; because the radical phenomenological epoché, in which it grows, puts the pregivenness of the world’s being out of action. I actually do not have a pregiven world any more, I rather have the absolute world life, in which pregivenness comes to pass for me.

But the same is said by: The most radical of all egoical reflections, the most universal of all possible attitudes, creates a new universal interest field for me, a new universe of being. I am still me, and being me is its Ego of interests, is its having a “world”, is living into it, striving into it, “being” in it, striving to preserve oneself in it. A new “world” thus is constituted in the phenomenological epoché as a pregiven one, it is the new interest field of the thereby newly constituted Ego of interests itself, which simply thereby is not a natural Ego of the naturally pregiven, preaccepted and exclusively accepted world: A new world, which is not next to the natural one though, not separate from it or supplementing it. The natural world is out of acceptance, its performance of acceptance is prevented, but in this modification still conscious. World as a “phenomenon”, as world in the epoché, still is only a mode, in which the same Ego, which has pregiven the world, investigates its sense in this pregivenness, and that, which it implies, and has not simply abandoned it and its acceptance therefore, or even made it simply disappear.

The exclusive habituality of the natural pregivenness, the horizon of actual and possible experience, has not vanished, if I, instead of “living” in “the” field of experience (in interested performance), abstain from this interest in a modifying way, simply thereby establishing in one a modified interest.

[224] This now goes exclusively into the direction of the universal experiencing of naturalness and its experienced, or rather, to its experienceable purely as such.

In the radical sense investigation of the Ego towards myself and my world pregiven from my own life of acceptance, and more closely from my univocally experiencing life, I become aware of my existence being only a conspicuous mode of my existence in the worldliness, essentially encompassing the possibility of a change into the mode of the absolute being for me. The Ego has been brought to universal acceptance in the mode of the absolute being for oneself, in its absolute being encompassing all its abilities, and at first to universal acceptance of experience. But having in acceptance essentially means some having-a-field-of-interest, field of universal life themes, horizon of the Ego’s possibilities, to be able to live into it, to work into it, to be able to preserve oneself therein. The epoché is phenomenological reduction to the Ego in the absolute being, i.e., in that being, encompassing all possibilities of being, that is, all possible fields of interest, as accessible to the Ego, as to be freely constructed from it and for it.

When worldly living along in a naturally way, I do not know anything of my world of experience, belonging to me as the horizon of existence (me as a worldly or human Ego), and which encompasses all my possibilities as a human Ego, but still does not encompass all my possibilities as an Ego as such. Within naturalness I do not know anything of life and striving as a man being a form of the Ego’s existence in the horizon of spatiotemporality, [a form] already delineating the character of some habituality of the Ego having become firm, or rather, of some habitual normal style of life, the Ego is continuously restricted to. This Ego, being conscious of itself as a naturally human one, always appearing itself as identically the same human Ego and possibly finding in a reflectively thematic way, has its experience world as its universal habitual horizon, as a system of identity (system of its objects as substrate of its themes) constituted in its streaming manifoldness of consciousness, whereby this streaming manifoldness of consciousness simply has its firm [225] style of habit, implying the firm general object style as correlate in the generality of this style, the firm general style of the world constituting itself, of the pregiven sphere of actual and possible thematic directions.

The Ego naturally living along, living into this world, predelineated according to the style, habitually being accepted by it in advance – this presumed one in the way of habit, but also normally actualized in a constituting way according to presumption -, simply has this world always only thematic, always only within its realm of experience and essence. It does not know that this world with its style of form, with this presumption, with this structure of acceptance belonging to this attitude, possible, findable, with this presumption springing from this style-like fulfillment has its subjective sources, that is, inseparably encompassed within the concretely grasped subjectivity itself as a shape constituted within it, of course in its presumptive How of constitution. The not-knowing-anything-of, although all that lies within the consciousness realm of the Ego as its life, life form, presumption, something synthetically constituting itself in the character of verified presumption, of course means, the thematic direction towards it is missing. But it is part of the Ego’s essence that it may any time reflect on that, which as every essential thing has again its consciousness sources in advance and from there its possibilities of reflective experience.

The epoché and reduction is the alteration of one’s attitude the Ego, naturally living along (having only the field of the world constituted in the hidden course of the subjective life and its synthesis, only the synthetic formation of unity in the thematic view as being there for it, as something identical), guides back in a thematizing way to the concrete subjectivity, in which this world is freed from its hidden abstraction and shows its actually concrete sense as a constituted sense formation in original experience.

The Ego frees itself through the phenomenological reduction as “transcendental reduction” from the limits of its existence’s naturalness, those of “naïve” humanity, frees itself so to say from a blinker, shading its absolute, [226] its completely concrete existence, or, which results in the same, shades an endless wealth of life possibilities to it, including those of natural existence indeed, in which though they are so to say abstractly incomplete.

The enormous difficulty of the energetic enlargement of the new possibilities of life proceeding in actual interpretation consists in reflections of the Ego on itself and its life being possible in the naturalness of the world life as well, and also belonging to their natural content of experience. The natural reflection as well leads to all the experiencing ways of consciousness (or should have led there in a theoretical purpose in an actually thorough psychology), through which the human Ego experiences the natural objects, the unity of nature as such, and thus on all higher steps the world being for it. But as the Ego finds itself in the natural reflection as human Ego and not only world related, but itself as in the world as something worldly being (spatiotemporal), thus all its experiencing mental livings, all subjective things found in reflection, simply also as something worldly real.

To thematically suspend the essential possibility, in universal consequence all of the world being for me through abstention from all positing of being, and to still keep the suspending subjectivity and its life as a field of possible experience, does not only create a new realm of research in this “transcendental subjectivity”, but in the further course results in all means to solve the problem of “psychologism”.

On top of that we need to emphasize that, if the transcendental reflection, that is, the first in itself, the experiencing one, leads transcendental subjectivity into the horizon of the view, and if the description, based on that, creates a science in theoretical attitude and the establishment of a phenomenologically theoretical research, sense and possibility of this science need to be understood from their own experiencing and theoretical performing, and it is basically wrong to ascribe the concept of natural science to this sense, to this concept of science.

[227] Also that is clear in advance that the system of corresponding transcendentally researching and ascertaining performances itself designates a system of subjective possibilities of the transcendental life, and here of the theoretical one, which uncovers as a transcendental one in reflection, and once again need to be treated likewise in a theoretical way. Of course the establishment of universal phenomenology is only complete, if it pays attention to the iterative repeatability of reflection, and thereby to the essential back relatedness of a concretely complete phenomenology, paying attention to all essential possibilities of the transcendental existence, <to itself, and> comprehends them in its thematic work.

Eventually it is not said that transcendental existence and that especially transcendental life in transcendental reflection is mere life in the theoretical interest, only that all possibilities of life, all possible ways of transcendental, straight or reflective life need to be ascertained only through transcendentally experiencing reflection in theoretical purpose, so that something may be said in truth on them, on every way of life, of striving, of self-preservation, being-in-the-transcendental-subjectivity it may passively or actively perform, may be brought into essential consciousness.

1. 23th October <19>30. Chiavari. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The clause from „cuoriosities“ up till the end of the paragraph is parenthesized with a pencil, at the margin on that: „Experience does not need <to> be doxic experience here!“ – Editor’s note [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Then the whole doctrine of core layers thus needed to follow in this course in the natural attitude, especially the differentiation between primordial experience and foreign experience, or through this mediated world experience. Furthermore, the subjectively psychological and intersubjective temporalization (as „idea of the world“ with regard to temporality). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 26th October 1930 <Chiavari> and ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Everything is interpreted here in natural attitude as that, which shall become a theme as a „phenomenon“; then at first in detail phenomenological epoché and reduction. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The wonders of reflection, by which we know of all of that. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Make a theme = a doxic one, a theme of being? Differ thoroughly! [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The uncovering reflection, the wonder of consciousness. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Not every occupation is experiencing indeed and in the doxic sense? [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. This requires some clarification in more detail though! But compare already the first pages. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Compare X2 <page 221,35-222,28>! This is not enough. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)