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GERMAN PHILOSOPHY SINCE HEGEL.
GERMAN PHILOSOPHY

SINCE HEGEL.

§ 331.

INTRODUCTION.

1. The decided ascendency which, particularly about the middle of the first twenty years of the century, was conceded to the Hegelian philosophy over all contemporary systems, is to be explained by the fact that it was a philosophy corresponding to the momentary lull which had followed the fierce conflicts in the political, religious, and ecclesiastico-political spheres; a philosophy which enemies by way of blame, and friends by way of praise, called a Restoration philosophy. This it is to a far greater extent than those who invented the name supposed. There are three points, namely, in which Hegel restored what previous to his time had been put in a tottering state,—especially by Kant, to whom, just on this account, Hegel is often unfair. First, he had attempted to restore to philosophy her "Holiest of holies," a Metaphysic, or Ontology, of which Kant had robbed her. The aim of his Logic was to give again to philosophy a Foundation Science, by showing what the Absolute is, and that it can only be reached by the dialectical method, the method, namely, which coincides with the self-movement of the content. Kant had, moreover, in his Critiques so strongly emphasized the legal (moral) element in Religion, that he was almost at one with the men of the Enlightenment, and their religion of good works; and even in his Religion Within the Limits of Mere Reason, where he parts company with them, the glad tidings of the Gospel appear almost like a fable invented in the interests of morality. Hegel seeks to restore a positive relation precisely to the theoretical element in Religion, and to do so not simply to the story of salvation as related in the Bible, but to
the doctrines developed with and in the Church. He boasts, therefore, of his philosophy, because it is so much more orthodox than the modern intuitional or scriptural theology, which is indifferent to dogma. Finally, in the third place, Kant, in the individualistic spirit of the eighteenth century, had in his doctrine of law put the individual person, and in his theory of morals the private conscience, so much in the foreground, that in contrast to this Hegel again took as the central point of his ethics the ancient notion of the moral organism, the dominating right of the whole, which is essentially different from the sum. The reproaches which were brought against him on account of this threefold restoration,—that he was predestined to be a new Wolff, that he had made the world a present of a new Scholasticism, that he had come forward like a new Herr von Haller in opposition to Liberalism,—may be accepted as correct if the proper emphasis is laid on the word “new.”

2. The year 1830 saw the beginning of a series of events which proved that the restoration and consolidation of what had been previously shaken fell far short of being so definite as had been hoped. The revolutions in France, Belgium, and Poland, the revolutionary movements connected with these in Germany, as well as the Parliamentary reform in England; the sharp points of difference in the various creeds, which once more came to light owing to the Papal bulls on mixed marriages, and to the celebration of the presentation of the Augsburg Confession; finally, the almost unheard-of attempt which was made, particularly in Prussia, by the ecclesiastical corporations and courts, to possess themselves of rights which the State had always exercised, such as the introduction of agenda or the control of the professors of theology—all proved that there might be a dissolution of what seemed to have been so perfectly put together. It will be easily understood that Hegel greeted none of these phenomena with pleasure, and met many of them with decided dislike. He could not help foreseeing—what soon also happened—that, as the foundations of what had hitherto been accepted were shaking, the foundations of reasoned existence could not escape being subjected to new tests; and he felt, too, that many amongst his younger friends would regard with pleasure what only pained him. Both things happened. Works appeared which attacked the foundations of his doctrines, and to which he replied in a collective criticism. But this came to a stand-still before he
had reached the most important of these works. An unpleasant encounter with his hitherto intimate friend, Professor Gans, which was occasioned by the political questions of the day, also occurred, and embittered the last weeks of his life.

3. The words spoken at his grave, to the effect that the satraps would have to share Alexander's kingdom amongst them, were followed by a war of succession more quickly than the speaker had imagined. The process of dissolution began in the Hegelian school soon after the death of its founder. Accompanying this dissolution, which is the negative side of the process of philosophical development after Hegel, we undoubtedly have, as its positive complement, the construction of new systems. Apart from the fact that most of those who assumed the latter work had been actively engaged in the process of dissolution, it will facilitate our survey if we first group together those phenomena which it can be proved all led to a common goal. This certainly involves the drawback that many authors will be discussed in two different parts in the treatise. By any other method, however, it would be still more difficult to find one's way through the labyrinth of post-Hegelian literature. But such a separation has been resorted to only when it appeared absolutely necessary. Where it was not necessary, and where a philosopher was mentioned for the first time, I have at once said everything regarding him that I had intended to say in this book. With this explanation we may turn to our double task. In accordance with our method, it will first be shown how the three points just referred to, in which Hegel had proved himself a restorer, were again brought into question after his death. They arose in the order in which they have been enumerated above, and indeed, so that the interest of the philosophical public in each of the three questions was sustained for pretty nearly the same period. After the logico-metaphysical question alone had been ventilated for about half a dozen years, the question raised by the philosophy of religion came suddenly to the front, to give place after about the same interval of time to the politico-social question. We have thus given in advance the three divisions into which the negative part of this investigation is divided.
FIRST DIVISION.

Dissolution of the Hegelian School.

A.—PHENOMENA IN THE LOGICO-METAPHYSICAL SPHERE.

§ 332.

1. Since the Hegelian school had the conviction that the logical foundation laid by Hegel was unshakable, it had no occasion to apply any test to show whether the content of the fundamental science had been properly constructed, whether its relation to the other parts of philosophy had been properly conceived, whether the method it had adopted did really harmonize with the self-movement of the object, and was therefore universally applicable. It is accordingly natural that in this group of phenomena, the anti-Hegelians in particular should take a prominent place, while to Hegel's followers there falls the rôle of defenders, who partly explain the teaching of the master, and partly give it greater definiteness in those points in which it had been left indefinite. The first attacks on Hegel's Logic appeared already during his life, and his intention was to have reviewed five of these together in the Berliner Jahrbücher. He let the matter rest, however, after having criticized the first two of those about to be mentioned. The work of Hülsemann, On the Hegelian Theory, or Absolute Knowledge and Modern Pantheism (Leipsic, 1829), which appeared anonymously, expresses by its title the objection it made to the system whose method it combated, and to which it opposed the distinction between reason and cause, a distinction which had been already made by Jacobi. To Hegel's not very friendly critique,—which, on account of its unctuous tone, was conjectured to have had a Catholic priest for its author,—Hülsemann replied in his work, On the Science of the Idea (Breslau, 1831). Along with this work, Hegel criticized Schubart and Carganico's work, On Philosophy in General and Hegel's Encyclopedia in Particular (Berlin, 1829). Schubart, in reply to this criticism, published his Explanation to Hegel. According to Schubart, philosophy is in no way a healthy manifestation like art, morality, religion, and empirical science, but a symptom of disease. It consists in the deification of the All, which, as the object of philosophy, is put by the ancients before the world, by modern philosophy and specially
by Hegel, in the world, and by Kant beyond the world. Hegel's fundamental error was, that he stretched too far the law of metamorphosis discovered by Goethe, a law which is confined to nature; and that thus he arrived at a theory which denied immortality and was revolutionary in politics, or at any rate decidedly anti-Prussian. This last objection is further developed in the pamphlet, *Hegel and Prussia* (Frankfort, 1841). The anonymous work of Kalisch, *Letters against the Hegelian Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences* (two Parts, Berlin, 1829, 1830), was taken little notice of. This was not the case with the work of General Rühle von Lilienstern, a soldier distinguished alike for intellectual power and learning: *R. v. L. On Being, Non-being, and Becoming* (Berlin, 1829). In this work, to begin with, Hegel's claim that his system was a circle of circles was rejected as inconceivable, and then special stress was laid on the point that, as there is only one single thought which by simple repetition gives something new, namely, Nothing,—which, thought of as nothing, gives us affirmation,—we ought to begin with this, and not with Being.

2. Of far more significance than all these works was that of a young man who was soon to belong to the weightiest opponents of the Hegelian philosophy. CHR. HERMANN WEISSE (born at Leipsic on August 10th, 1801; qualified as Privatdocent there in 1822; and died when full Professor of Philosophy on the 19th of September, 1866), in his work, *On the Present Standpoint of the Philosophical Sciences* (Leipsic, 1829), declared himself a follower of the Hegelian *Logic*, which he asserted had for its result what the System of Identity had begun with, and just for this reason counted all opponents of the latter as its own. The one omission in the *Logic* was, that it did not include within its province time and space, which, exactly like the other categories treated of by Hegel, belong to the necessary elements of thought. On the other hand, Hegel made far too large claims for his *Logic*; for although it is simply the groundwork of the real parts of philosophy, which has to do only with the universal forms of all reality, yet he placed it on an equality with these forms, and even set it above them, since he purposed by starting from the forms of being to reach in a logical way what exists in these forms, to get to matter, in fact. Since matter is not something absolutely necessary, but exists owing to the determination of some Being, we require here a higher form of cogni-
tion in which logical and actual knowledge interpenetrate, so that Nature and Spirit are recognised as what is higher, as contrasted with the logical Idea; and speculative theology, which Hegel identifies with logic, is made the keystone of the system. Weisse took up pretty much the same standpoint in his System of Æsthetics (Leipsic, 1830), where, besides the objection that Hegel's doctrine, by overvaluing logic, results in a logical Pantheism, fault is found with Hegel because in his theory of Absolute Spirit he places science above art and religion, instead of closing his system with the latter, and because he puts the theory of cognition, or the science of knowledge, before both. In connection with his Æsthetics, Weisse has achieved the merit,—a merit recognised even by thinkers of an opposite school,—of having in the First Part, which treats of beauty in its universality and subjectivity, thoroughly examined the notion of the Ugly, apart from which, amongst other things, the humorous cannot be understood. The Second Part treats of the Beautiful in its special forms and objectivity in the separate arts; and, finally, the Third Part, which treats of the Beautiful in its individuality, or where beauty has a subjective-objective existence, paves the way, by considering the nature of genius, moral beauty, and love, for the transition to speculative theology. Before Weisse, however, published this work, Hegel had died; and he brought out a work entitled, On the Relation of the Public to Philosophy at the time of Hegel's Decease (Leipsic, 1832). The indifference which the public was beginning to show in regard to philosophy, Weisse explains from the fact, that what the preceding period had sought after, philosophy up to this time, working in harmony with the heroes of literature, had accomplished. It had consistently worked out the thought of an organic unity of reality or of nature. To the need, now awakened, of giving to the Godhead the proper place in the system, philosophy does not respond. Hegel in particular substituted the Absolute Idea for the Godhead, and thereby reached a logical Pantheism; and Weisse no longer allows, as he did above, that Hegel's Absolute Idea is the same as the Absolute of the System of Identity. The true system should undoubtedly be divided into Logic, the Philosophy of Nature, and the Philosophy of Spirit. Time and Space ought, however, to be treated of in the Logic and in the Philosophy of Nature, in what Hegel calls the Swoon of Nature, the
system ought rather to recognise the freedom which goes beyond what is logical; and the Philosophy of Nature ought to be, therefore, no longer merely logical construction, but a philosophical empiricism. He thinks that the Philosophy of Spirit in particular ought to get a wholly different form from what it has in Hegel. In the Anthropology and Psychology, sense-perception, understanding, and reason ought to be deduced a priori, while at the same time justice ought to be done to empirical observation. The doctrine of Objective Spirit would give an account of language, the State, and universal history; and would represent the last-mentioned as a teleology of the spirit, in which there is a striving after what is reached by science, art, and religion. The treatment of these would fall to the doctrine of Absolute Spirit, which corresponds to the Ideas of Truth, Beauty, and Goodness. Thus the lowest place would be occupied by an encyclopedia of the sciences, the second by aesthetics, the third by the philosophy of religion, which coincides with ethics, and which, in opposition to pantheism and deism, must hold fast by a personal God and moral freedom. As the defender of Hegel against all these writings of Weisse, there now came forward the man whom the master's previously mentioned "shake of the hand" (§ 329, 10) had so ennobled in the eyes of his School, that they awaited the appearance of his work with the greatest expectation and greeted it with applause. Göschel's 'Monism of Thought' (Naumburg, 1832), which called itself an Apology by Modern Philosophy at the grave of its Founder, seeks to prove to Weisse that he had fallen into the hands of the arch enemy of all philosophy, into dualism. By his separation of the formal and the real sciences, he separated form and matter, that is, thought and being, whose unity is maintained by the more recent philosophy, according to which our thought is a reflection of creative thought. Since its method consists in the self-formation of the matter of thought, it has thereby surmounted formalism and materialism, into both of which precisely dualism falls, and dualism is absolutely incompatible with the Hegelian logic and method. The last remark bore very strongly on the circumstance, at all events striking, that Weisse, in word and deed, had shown himself to be a follower of the method which was intended to be the self-movement of the content, and yet demanded a philosophy with a wholly different con-
tent. And Weisse felt this so keenly, that in his next work, *The Idea of the Godhead* (Dresden, 1833), he let the dialectic method, which, according to his whole theory, ought to be employed above all in Logic, fall into the background. This work constitutes only the first part of Weisse's speculative theology. The second part, which was to have contained the philosophy of religion as a development of the historical forms of the religious consciousness, and the third part, which was to have contained the Ethics, did not appear. The pretentious tone manifest, not only in the preface to the book,—in which Weisse compares himself to the sibyl, because he concedes to the Hegelian philosophy a smaller and smaller amount of truth at the price of ever greater concessions,—but also in the book itself; and the oft-recurring remark, that here for the first time this or that difficulty is solved, not only drew down on Weisse some bitter attacks, but also resulted in his book being far less read than, for instance, Billroth's *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* (Leipsic, 1837, 2nd ed., 1844), which I edited, and which in reality merely repeat the thoughts first expressed by Weisse. The line of thought pursued in Weisse's book is as follows: The opposition between the ideas of the True and the Beautiful, which lies at the basis of that between science and art, is done away with in the idea of the Good. This is the leading idea in the ontological argument which, while uniting perfection and existence, unites beauty and truth without knowing it. Pantheism, as represented in the history of philosophy by Plato and Spinoza, does not get beyond this idea, which binds those two together in an immediate unity. If, on the contrary, the unity of both is thought of, not as an immediate existing unity, but as a unity of the underlying principle, then we are led to Deism, whose argument is the cosmological one, and whose philosopher is Leibnitz. The Christian idea goes beyond both of these one-sided conceptions, and has hitherto been grasped only by some mystics. It corresponds to the teleological argument, and demands that the doctrine of the Trinity be put on a speculative basis, by means of which,—in contrast with Deism, which sees in the world a mere piece of God's workmanship, and with pantheism, which sees in it simply a result of God,—we are enabled to comprehend creation, and redemption which is its goal, as well as immortality, though only that of the regenerate; while the antinomies of time and eternity, etc.,
are also harmonized. Weisse's book was an attempt towards this, though he afterwards confessed that he had done violence to the historical material.

3. Before passing on to the work which is Weisse's public disavowal of the Hegelian philosophy, mention may be made of certain publications the influence of which upon him is established beyond doubt by the alteration which they occasioned in his terminology. In North Germany, Schelling's influence in Munich had become something almost mysterious; and the way in which he treated those who, like F. Kapp,—who afterwards certainly took a terrible revenge,—told tales out of school, did not serve to spread his doctrines more widely. FRIEDRICH JULIUS STAHL (born on the 16th of January 1802, in Munich; died when Professor in Berlin and a member of the Prussian Upper House, at Brückenauf, on the 10th of August, 1862), in the critical part of his Philosophy of Law from an Historical Point of View (2 vols., Heidelberg, 1830, 3rd ed., 1854), was the first to call attention to the fact, that while Hegel maintained the standpoint of the System of Identity, according to which the universal impersonal Reason comes to constitute individual personalities, and is thus the process by which the Absolute becomes personal in man, Schelling himself had gone beyond this. This is evident from the fact that he constructs philosophy,—which knows nothing higher than reason, and is thus rationalism with an analytic method,—of one part which may be called the negative part, because, for reason, that only is valid which cannot not be,—i.e. bare necessity; while to this he adds as its complement a second positive part, in which speculation gives a true doctrine of freedom, and in which the place of the process in the former part is taken by divine action and will. That Schelling did not, as in Kapp's case, come forward with threats against this publication, renders it probable that he approved of it, or at any rate that he did not see in it any misrepresentation of his views. This became still more probable when the general introduction of J. Sengler's work, On the Signification of Speculative Philosophy (Heidelberg, 1837), appeared, which was followed later by the special introduction. In this, the true philosophy, which begins where rationalism ends, and conceives of the world as a free creation, was contrasted with rationalistic speculation. All doubts, however, disappeared when Schelling himself gave expression
to his views in almost identical terms, in his Preface to H. Beckers' *Translation of a Fragment by Cousin* (Stuttgarter, 1834), which, owing to the bitter manner in which he treated his former friends, gave just offence to the Hegelians. According to the *Preface*, philosophy must begin with the necessary element in thought, or just with what cannot *not* be thought, and which is thus of an entirely *a priori* character,—pure rationalism in fact,—because this absolutely necessary element, without which nothing is, is what is absolutely prior to God Himself and constitutes the peculiar possession of reason. With this, however, there is only given, to begin with, the negative *conditio sine qua non* of knowledge; and the transition from this to positive philosophy, which is the most difficult point in the whole system, is made by getting a thorough grasp of the real process. Hegel, who wished to make the transition from the logical to the real in a logical way, never gets beyond Logic, or if he does, it is only by sophisms. He turns the process of reality into a wholly absurd process of the Notion, and predicates of mere being what has meaning only in reference to actual existence. True philosophy, therefore, rises superior to the opposition of rationalism and empiricism. If the empirical moment is let go, as is done by Hegel, then philosophy is changed into rationalism. The less there was to be found in these words of anything really definite, as to what positive philosophy should contain, and as to how the transition was to be made to it from the negative part, made it all the more easy for every one to picture a Schelling according to his own taste. Accordingly there scarce ever was a time when Schelling was so much praised from quite opposite quarters as then, when nobody knew what he taught. In a style which often reminds us of Goethe's *Grosskophta*, all anti-Hegelians appealed to Schelling. The empiricists saw in him a convert to empiricism; the pectoral theologians rejoiced over his attack on the deification of the Notion; the orthodox appealed to the fact that he put what was positive above all else; in short, every one believed that he might close his statements with the remark, that Schelling would doubtless say the same thing. This is true to a certain extent even of Weisse, whose *Outlines of Metaphysic* (Hamburg, 1835) showed that Tarquin must still have been stiff-necked, since so much of what had been previously conceded to Hegel was now taken back; and certainly, along
with this, much that Weisse had previously taught was retracted. He seeks to set up in opposition to the Hegelian system of necessity, a system of freedom, which in its concrete parts deals with what cannot also be otherwise than it is, and with what may also be otherwise; and he holds that the Metaphysical part, which has to do with what cannot not be otherwise and what cannot be otherwise, must be preceded by a science of self-explanation, by a Logic in fact, which by an analysis of consciousness must establish the importance of the negation of the negation, as well as the applicability of the dialectical method to all parts of philosophy. How it accomplishes this, is discussed in a paper in Fichte's Zeitschrift belonging to the year 1837: On the Three Fundamental Questions of Contemporary Philosophy. A start is made with the known fact that it is impossible to abstract from certain forms which belong to all reality, and that these may be treated scientifically. Such forms are: Number, which constitutes the subject of arithmetic; Space, which constitutes the subject of geometry; and Time, which constitutes the subject of pure mechanics. These, then, are the central categories in the three parts of metaphysics, which sets up a system of those forms which underlie all reality when it exists, and therefore with hypothetical necessity. Since number with Hegel, too, occupies a central place, Weisse, in the first Part of the Metaphysics, which treats of the doctrine of Being under the headings of quality, quantity, and measure, shows but little divergence from Hegel. The divergence is much greater in the second Part, in the doctrine of Essence, where the specific units of essentiality, the categories of the notion of space and the fundamental characteristics of what is corporeal, make up the sections. The divergence is greatest of all in the third Part, in the doctrine of Reality, which treats of the categories of reflection, of the notion of time, and finally of the fundamental characteristics of living existence. It closes with the absolutely free spiritual essence, from which as a free Creator the world gets its reality. Owing to the fact that Weisse expressly connects the first part with the earlier ontology, the second with cosmology, and the third with psychology and theology, and now treats of cohesion, gravity, and so on, in the second part of the fundamental science, and of spirit in the third part, the questions continually force themselves upon the reader: What is still left, then, for the
concrete sciences? and, How far can gravity and cohesion be called forms of all existence and therefore, too, of immaterial existence? The first question is met by the statement that here we have to do, not with actual gravity, but with the notion of gravity. The second question remains unanswered.

4. Before Weisse again appears in another place, mention must be made of what was accomplished by one who afterwards stood in a very close relation to him, Immanuel Hermann Fichte (born 1797; made professor in Bonn in 1835; from 1842 till his retirement in 1865, professor in Tübingen; was raised to the rank of a nobleman, and is still living in Stuttgart.) [Fichte died at Stuttgart, Aug. 8th, 1879.—Ed.] He had already at an earlier period made himself known by his Propositions towards a Prospedent of Theology (Stuttgart, 1826), and still more by his Contributions to the Characterization of Modern Philosophy (Sulzbach, 1829. 2nd ed., 1841), which, as the title itself suggests, have as their problem the mediation of opposites. In the first section, the merit of Leibnitz, Locke, Berkeley and Hume is stated to consist in the fact that they brought into the fore-ground the question of the origin of knowledge. In the second section, it is further shown that Kant, who found in this a point of contact with the latter, as well as Jacobi, who supplemented Kant’s views, both fell into a contradiction, the former into that of the thing-in-itself and appearance, the latter into that of faith and knowledge. The Science of Knowledge began to solve this contradiction; and for this reason, accordingly, in the third section (in the form, however, in which Fichte stated it in Berlin, vid. § 315, 2), it is given the place of honour as beginning the present period. The System of Identity, which is closely connected with the Science of Knowledge, approaches too near to Spinozism, although its transformation into the science of logic, especially by the improved application of the dialectic method, constitutes the highest point reached by the philosophy of the present day—a point from which alone any further development is possible. What is to be expected from this philosophy, is shown in the fourth section, which finds fault with all previous systems for making too little of individuality. This comes from their not rising to the thought of a free creating God, who wishes to see His image in free spirits. But because what originates in freedom is not to be determined a priori, the development of the Notion
stops short here, and requires to be supplemented by the perception of reality; and the philosophy of freedom must at the same time be a science of experience of the most real sort. Fichte expressed himself regarding Hegel in quite a different way and much more sharply in another work, which he himself calls a continuation of the Contributions and at the same time the first part of his system: On the Contrast, Turning Point, and Aim of Contemporary Philosophy (Heidelberg, 1832). Of the three tendencies in philosophy, the objective tendency, or the one-sided theory of being, has partly a constructive character, as in the case of Spinoza, Schelling, Oken, Wagner, Blasche, Hegel, and others, and partly a mystical character, as in the case of Baader, Günther, Görres, St. Martin, Schubert. Amongst these tendencies, the system of Hegel, that "masterpiece of erroneous consistency or consistent error," is treated in greatest detail, as the pantheism which does not indeed make God all things, but certainly makes Him all spirits. There is common to both groups the presupposition of the identity of thought and being. In contrast to them, accordingly, stands the subjective or reflective tendency, of which the chief representatives are Kant and Jacobi, and along with them Fries and Bouterwek, whose views are closely connected with theirs. This tendency finally results in a subjective scepticism. The third mediating tendency is represented chiefly by Troxler and Krause, whom Fichte rightly calls the special pioneers of his own efforts, the former on account of the matter of his theories, the latter because in his system the first part has an analytic-inductive character. In fact, the true philosophy, just as it binds together experience and the Notion, must also unite the doctrine of being and the doctrine of knowledge, and thus not simply be a theory of knowledge, although in the first part it has to be this. Fichte says of this true philosophy, that it is not put forward as a new system in opposition to previous systems, but comprehends them all, while it is at the same time a history of philosophy. This remark stamped him in the eyes of many as an eclectic. In reality, Fichte himself, in spite of the fact that this name annoyed him, showed himself to be an eclectic, when in one of his later works he speaks of his intention "of conducting my own philosophical investigations historically only." One who, like Fichte, so readily appropriates every new thought of another, and indeed every new
interpretation of thought quite foreign to his own, in order
"to supplement it," "to get a deeper grasp of it," "to carry it
further," cannot very easily find a place amongst the philo-
sophers of modern times. By following this method he has
caused a good deal of irritation, and has not always steered
clear of the rocks against which he warned Sengler in the
Circular Letter he addressed to him. Fichte also repeated after-
wards, that the time for founding schools and systems was at
an end, although intimations are not wanting that the different
equally warranted systems should first start from his own,
while progress would consist in their co-operation. And now
to pass to the system itself. It is in accordance with what
has just been said, that in Fichte's Outlines of a System of
Philosophy (Heidelberg, 1833), the first part treats of know-
ledge as knowledge of self. It is here shown that the inner
dialectic urges consciousness to raise itself from the stage
of perception to that of knowledge. The exposition, which
often reminds us of his father's Pragmatic History of Intel-
ligence (vid. § 312, 4), and still more of Schelling's Transcen-
dental Idealism (vid. § 318, 1), which it follows even in its
confusion of epochs and periods; and finally, frequently of
Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit (§ 329, 2), distinguishes in
each of the four stages through which consciousness passes
(perception, presentation, thought, knowledge), three sub-
stages, and closes by showing that the one-sidedness of rational
perception (Troxler), and the one-sidedness of speculative
thought (Hegel), are done away with in the speculative
intuitive knowledge, which thinks upon what was originally
thought in God. Thus the contrast of a priori and a
posteriori, of philosophy and theosophy, disappears; and in
particular this result is reached, that there can be no talk of a
contrast of thought and being when we have arrived at absolute
being. Accordingly, Fichte is able to sum up the results of this
part as follows: Knowledge is not simply knowledge of self,
but as such proves itself at the same time to be knowledge of
truth, of being. From this point onwards philosophy is know-
ledge of being, or ontology, which constitutes its second divi-
sion. He presents at the same time its further development as
follows: Within ontology the same course of progress holds
good; the thought of primal being unfolds itself by means
of ever richer mediating determinations into that of primal
spirit; from knowledge of being is produced knowledge of
God; from primal truth comes what is the highest and at the same time the richest truth, and this again diffuses itself in the revelation it gives through the world of nature and spirit; in the knowledge of which consciousness goes completely round its philosophical cycle, and yet remains absolutely with itself. It was natural, owing to the position which Fichte had assigned to Hegel, that he should have hailed with delight the objection expressed in Schelling’s Preface, that Hegel did not get beyond Rationalism. The little work, *On the Conditions of a Speculative Theism* (Heidelberg, 1835), grew out of a notice of this Preface. We may certainly regard it as a mark of the influence of Schelling’s Preface, that Fichte thereupon censures Hegel so severely for not duly separating being from what actually is, *i.e.* the existent; a separation which up to this time Fichte had not made himself. This took place most notably in the *Ontology* (Heidelberg, 1836), which appeared as a second part of the *Outlines*, though not in quite a complete form, as the third part, the doctrine of ideas, was at first held back by Fichte. Besides taking up the *Logic* of Hegel, the starting-point of which Fichte admits that he takes, a great deal of consideration was given to Weisse’s *Metaphysics*, without its being actually mentioned. Just because the former of these works was made the starting-point, Fichte’s relation to it is mostly polemical, while he is in agreement with the second work in some very essential points. Thus, for instance, *Ontology* is to Fichte the science only of the forms of existence, infinite as well as finite. It does not have to do with the positive constituent parts of divine reality, so that it requires to be supplemented by the concrete and real parts of philosophy, which comprise experience, and show not only what belongs to real being, but that there is something real. His agreement with Weisse is seen most of all in the fact that he reckons Time and Space amongst the universal forms of existence or reality, and proposes to treat them, just as he did Number, in *Ontology*. Just as Hegel, in the first exposition of his *Logic*, notwithstanding the trichotomy, classed together the first two parts as Objective Logic, Fichte, too, who, in the headings *Doctrine of Being* (§§ 1–125) and *Doctrine of Essence* (§§ 126, 304), was quite at one with Hegel and Weisse, brought together these two parts under a common name. Of course, since according to his arrangement the greater part of what Hegel treats of in the
“Subjective Logic” fell to the theory of Knowledge, he was not able to retain this name, and just as little that of Objective Logic. In contrast, accordingly, to the Doctrine of Categories, which embraces the first two parts of the Ontology,—which at first appeared alone,—he brings forward the third part in the form of a Doctrine of Ideas. Categories, then, are forms of all reality, forms of existence; Ideas, on the other hand, are forms of every real system, world-forms. With reference to the first part of ontology, the Doctrine of Being, or the "sphere of simple notions," Fichte here, and also in a later work, lays stress on his divergence from Hegel, inasmuch as he treats quantity before quality. But, since he makes all those categories which Hegel had called categories of quality, precede quantity as the original categories, the difference between him and Hegel is not so very great. In fact, it seems to disappear altogether when Fichte, in the later work just referred to, puts it thus: quantity presupposes the qualitative. Connected with this there is the awkward circumstance, that Fichte now treats under the heading of quality categories which, as he himself allows, are notions of relation; and yet, according to his own express declaration, their sphere ought to constitute the second part, the doctrine of Essence. More important are still other points of difference, which at the same time concern Fichte's most essential doctrines. Fichte repeatedly asserts that no real contradiction arises, but only an ontological one, when thoughts which we employ show that they stand in need of a complement, and without which therefore they are mutually contradictory; as, for instance, predicate-notions without subject, formal notions without matter, effects without causes, and so on. This assertion, with which he connected his discussions on the dialectic method, led many of Hegel's followers to reproach him with having made of this method a purely regressive process by means of determinations of reflection. If at this point it was the formal methodological difference between the two systems which came especially into view, the material difference appeared particularly in the anti-Spinozistic zeal with which Fichte, with frequent appeals to Leibnitz, maintains the reality of many primal positions and monads, by means of which ground is gained for a philosophical view to which Fichte soon begins to attach the title of a system of individuality. This name, as also the way in which he emphasises the eternal nature
of the primal-positions, together with the distinction he makes between these and the (uniting) monads and (conscious) spirit-monads, belongs to a somewhat later time. In the ontology, the primal-positions which are to be conceived of as the work of the primal-Spirit, are especially spoken of as a means of deliverance from Pantheism; and in this connection Herbart alone is credited with having recognised a part of the truth. It was unfortunate both for the reception and the comprehension of Fichte’s system, that the Ontology appeared without the parts constituting the Philosophy of the Real; for when in the former mention is made of assimilation, soul, spirit, primal-spirit, and so on, little help is to be got from the repeated warnings that all this must be understood only ontologically, and not at all in the sense of a Philosophy of the Real. Even those who interested themselves in Fichte could not get rid of the feeling that it was unfortunate that he did not even prepare for his own use an encyclopedic survey of his system, and thus avoid including in formal philosophy what belonged to the Philosophy of the Real. It was still more unfortunate that the doctrine of Ideas, about which he had remarked that it coincided with speculative theology, did not appear simultaneously with the doctrine of Categories. To assert that speculative theology was a formal science, did not please the one side; to say that in it the negative dialectic was to make way for the positive, appeared to the other side to separate it too much from the rest of ontology. Finally, still others saw in Fichte’s remark, that after formal philosophy was completed, there still remained, as real objects, God, nature, and spirit, the announcement of two different theologies, a formal and a real. His essay, written in 1838, On the Relation between Formal and Real Principles, which was the above-mentioned Circular Letter to Sengler, did not satisfy even his friends, who advised him to finish his system with speculative theology, and not, as he here does, with the philosophy of history. The points of contact between Fichte and Weissé were so many, that when the former founded the Zeitschrift für Philosophie und speculative Theologie (appeared from 1837–42 in Bonn, and then in Tübingen, and from 1847 in Halle under the editorship of Fichte and Ulrici, who were joined by Wirth in 1852), and Weissé became one of the most constant contributors, the public got accustomed to regard the standpoint of the two men as one and the same. This feeling
was strengthened by the mutual acknowledgement of what each had got from the other. Weisse confessed that it was by Fichte's influence that he had been brought to separate the theory of knowledge from metaphysics, while Fichte, on the other hand, praised Weisse's theory of time and space and bore testimony to the fact that his friend was the only one who was able to write an encyclopædia of philosophy, and so on. It had not been noticed by readers of the Zeitschrift that soon after it started some differences of opinion had been referred to; and so people went on mentioning Fichte and Weisse together as if they were one man, till at last Weisse in his Circular Letter to Fichte, The Philosophical Problem of the Present (Leipsic, 1842), publicly forbade this, not altogether to Fichte's satisfaction. Fichte, too, must here be left for a time, till his later works come under discussion (vid. § 346, 4).

5. Fichte's Zeitschrift, which had originated in conscious opposition to Hegel, became, as will readily be understood, the audience-chamber of all anti-Hegelians. For this reason Karl Philipp Fischer, who was formerly at Tübingen and is now at Erlangen [Fischer afterwards removed to Kunnstatt, and died at Landau, Feb. 25, 1885—Ed.], became one of the contributors. In spite of many points of contact between his views and those of Weisse and Fichte, he differed from them to this extent, that he did not take Hegel as his starting-point, as had been done by the former, nor the later form of the Science of Knowledge, as had been done by the latter, but Schelling's Munich Lectures, along with those of Baader and Oken which he had also attended. From the first he was influenced by Hegel merely in a formal way. His work: The Freedom of the Human Will in the Progress of its Moments (Tübingen, 1833), develops the thought that the creative will of God,—the will which God has, as distinguished from the will by which God is and which He is,—is the only reality. This will shows itself in the animal merely as something impelling, as impulse. In man, however, it shows itself in such a way that at first, as primitive man, he rather repeats it in himself unconsciously, and then, since he is able to set himself in opposition to it, he actually does so, but finally, by the help of the Redeemer, in whom the Son of God is one with God the Son, he attains to perfect freedom. This work was followed by Outlines of the Science of Metaphysics (Stuttgart, 1834). In complete contrast to Fichte and Weisse as influenced by Fichte, both
of whom censured Hegel for claiming that his Metaphysic was a Logic as well, Fischer allows that Hegel had given a Logic, i.e., a science of the subjective forms of thought, but no Metaphysic. This last, as the general foundation of the real sciences,—the philosophy of nature, of subjective and objective spirit, and of religion,—is accordingly divided into the four parts of cosmology, psychology, pneumatology, and theology. In a way which shows that his attendance on Baader’s lectures had borne fruit, Fischer in the First Part carries out more fully, and at the same time more definitely, the thoughts which had been developed in his first work, particularly the distinction made between primitive man, in whom the processes of creation and self-creation are still one, and man as he appears in history. The Second Part defines feeling, imagination and reason as stages in the liberation of the will as it manifests itself in the subjective spirit, and closes with the relation of man to God. Pelagianism and Augustinianism are refuted by the doctrine of freedom, and the passing through the stage of Polytheism is laid down, as in Schelling’s Philosophy of Mythology, as a condition of the appearance of the Son of God. The Third Part, the doctrine of objective spirit, is almost exclusively occupied with history, the three periods of which take the form of the kingdom of the Father, Son, and Spirit. Thus they are not revelations of an hypostatized abstraction, such as Hegel’s World-Spirit is, but are the revelations of a creative will. In the Fourth Part, finally, from the life of man as consisting of essence, soul, and spirit, and as the image of God, is inferred the triple personality of God Himself. The Creation, the Fall, and Redemption are also discussed, though not without a repetition of what was contained in the First Part. In the real creation of primitive man, God became conscious of his being, in the Redeemer’s existence in time of His will, and in the completion of the objective spirit, of His idea—conscious, that is, in the actual way in which He loves and is loved, knows and is known. The feeling that here metaphysics, even if only in outline, contains all that was to have been looked for from the parts of the philosophy of reality, is perhaps the reason why Fischer later (vid. § 346, 8), when he wrote an encyclopedia of the philosophical sciences, let the latter go. What distinguishes him, —not to his disadvantage, be it said,—from Fichte and Weisse, with whom the reading public associated him, is, that he allowed
himself to be influenced, to a much greater extent than either of these, by Oken, and particularly by Baader.

6. CHRISTLIEB JULIUS BRANISS (born on the 18th September, 1792, in Breslau, where he was Professor of Philosophy from the year 1826 until he was pensioned in 1870, and where he died in 1873), brought himself into notice by his successful prize essay: *Logic in Relation to Science* (Berlin, 1823), and still more by his highly brilliant and able work: *On Schleiermacher's Theory of Faith* (Berlin, 1824). In this latter work he showed that, according to Schleiermacher's principles, the perfect man could not appear in the middle but only at the end of history. Braniss was looked upon, and is still by many, as a disciple of Steffens. He is not exclusively so at any rate, as is proved by his *Outlines of Logic* (Breslau, 1830), in which from the logic of the notion of sense-perception and understanding he passes to the logic of the notion of reason, and comes to the conclusion that scientific thought consists merely in the fact that the subject carries into execution the self-movement of the idea, and that logic has to describe the form which this act on the part of the subject takes. Accordingly it is shown that every finite notion is only a relative unity of thought and being, and that owing to this relativity it is in contradiction with itself and demands the removal of this contradiction in a higher notion. Since the contradiction repeats itself in this higher notion, the way leads from the false or abstract to what is true, and its goal is the totality of all those notions, the Idea, namely, as the absolute unity of thought and being. This process is entitled by Braniss, construction, and not dialectic, as Hegel called it. In the closest connection with the *Logic* stands Braniss' *System of Metaphysics* (Breslau, 1834). After a most delightful introduction,—and introductions are Braniss' strong point; for his most widely-read book, *The History of Philosophy since Kant* (Königsberg, 1842), does not get beyond the Introduction, and does not even finish that,—and by means of a preamble appended to it, Braniss reaches the following conclusions: Free thought by an act of resolution is enabled to abstract, first of all, from any given content. This, however, appears still in the form of a negative relation to such content, and must therefore also abstract from it. This done, nothing is left remaining but that act, hence pure action, and with this we ought to begin, and not with pure being, as Hegel does. Absolute action by being thought
is made into an object, and is therefore a form of being. We thus get two-opposite determinations, action and being, and these when united give us being which has resulted from its act, i.e., the positing of self or consciousness, so that the absolute act presents itself as absolute spirit. Since, however, it may be further shown that this absolute spirit can only be thought of as existing, a fact which seems to vindicate the ontological argument, we therefore pass from the absolute act in which, to begin with, the notion of God did not occur, to God. The first part of metaphysics is thus ideal theology, which finds no contradiction in the result arrived at, and therefore no dialectic motive for going further. It explains the idea of God in its several parts, and thus comes to the conclusion that God is to be thought of as a creating created personality, who embraces the Notion of Himself. Reflection on one's own being, however, as distinguished from that content, gives rise, in the first place as actual fact, to a knowledge which has for its content: There is an other besides God; and since there is no existence except what is posited by Him, God posits an other than Himself. The ideal cosmology gives the explication of this proposition as the second part of Metaphysics. Since it is here evident that the activity of God in positing His “other” is an activity which shows itself in negation, and that in virtue of this, what is external to God is shown to be nothing, the act of positing turns out to be a positing out of nothing, i.e., creation. Since, further, the creative act comes to an end in the creature and yet remains, we get in this way a graduated series of created things (cf. Schelling in his Philosophy of Nature, § 318, 4). These are first considered only in reference to their form in ontology, which thus develops all the categories that follow from the notion of the creature, and that arrive at the category of Ideality as the highest of all, i.e., at what the creature ought to be. In getting so far, however, metaphysics has reached a point at which, because it lays the basis for ethics, just as ontology does for physics, it is called by Braniss, Ethicology (Teleology would perhaps have been better). As it was shown in the Ontology that it lies in the notion of the creature to originate, to continue, to be manifold, separate, and so on, the Ethicology shows how action realizes itself in three stages,—in the form of existence which results from the action of opposing forces, namely, matter; in the action which sets itself an end, namely, life; to whose highest stage, which
goes beyond the life of plants and animals, this action raises itself, so as to do away with the inner opposition; that is, it raises itself to the stage of spirit. Spirit itself passes through the stages of the soul, the thinking and willing subject, in which the ontological forms become forms of thought, and whose subjective desires become objective, and finally through the stage of free spirit, in which God reveals Himself as in something that is a reflection of Himself. The active form assumed by the free spirit in morality, where cognition becomes recognition of God, and volition obedience to the Divine will, is the realized end of the world, in which the act of God and the act of self are brought into harmony. The question whether this end is immediately reached by the spirit's negating itself and allowing the affirmation of God to be realized in it, or whether the spirit does not permit this, and thereby becomes evil, so that the realization of the end of the world becomes possible only by means of redemption, is not one to be decided a priori. This question, accordingly, leads to the consideration of the Idea in the actual world, i.e., it takes us from metaphysics or ideal philosophy to the philosophy of the Real, which treats of nature in its actual form and of history. Braniss has not, however, given us the philosophy of the real, and has thus left it with each reader of his Metaphysics to answer for himself the question whether, had a philosophy of the real been forthcoming, the same thing would not have happened with Braniss as with Weisse, Fichte, and Fischer, namely, that a great deal would have disappeared from the ideal philosophy, or would have appeared twice in the system.

7. The school of Hegel did not remain silent in presence of any of these attacks. The Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik in particular, then undoubtedly the foremost journal of learning, espoused the cause of its spiritual father. In reply to the work of Rühle von Lilienstern it was observed by K. R. (Rosenkranz ?) that philosophical conceptions were not to be constructed according to geometrical methods (June, 1835). Weisse's works were criticized by Gabler (September, 1832), and indirectly by Hinrichs also, when he (July, 1832) wrote a notice of Göschel's Monism. Both repeat in reality only what the last-mentioned had said. The attacks made from the neo-Schellingian standpoint gave special provocation to the School. Stahl was attacked by Feuerbach (July, 1835) in a witty but coarse manner; Sengler, by the author of these
Outlines (April, 1835) with the assurance which is unfortunately wont to characterize the criticisms of budding authors. Schelling's Preface called Hinrichs to arms (February, 1835), and Gabler (October, 1835) considered it was his duty not to be behind him. Weisse's Metaphysics, which has many points of contact with the views of Schelling, found in Rosenkranz (April, 1835) a bitter critic. Fichte's Contributions were criticized by Michelet (May, 1830) and his Contrast and Turning-point by Hinrichs (November, 1832, and May, 1835). The former finds fault with Fichte's transcendentalism, the latter with his dualism. The first-mentioned is silent as to the charge of pantheism made against Hegel, the second energetically repels it. Fichte's Ontology was discussed in detail in a book by Schaller which will be immediately mentioned. Of the writings of Fischer mentioned above immediately after those of Fichte, the first was very favourably dealt with by Gösche (November, 1833), and the larger work, the Metaphysics, was treated in a thorough manner by Schmidt in Erfurt, who recognised its merits even when he was finding fault with it. Objection was especially made to Fischer's way of looking at everything as the product of will, and at the same time as dialectically necessary. Braniss, finally, found a critic for his Metaphysics in Rosenkranz (March, 1835), who took up his Logic at the same time. He finds fault with some things, but welcomes the book because he says there is philosophy in it, and not mere talk about philosophy. Julius Schaller (born in Magdeburg in 1810, died in 1868 when professor of philosophy in Halle) defended the Hegelian standpoint against all these attacks at once, not only in a separate criticism, but in a work of his own. His Philosophy of Our Time (Leipsic, 1837), after an historical introductory section, seeks to refute the objections which had been brought against the Hegelian philosophy, namely, that it was dogmatism and formalism, that it denied freedom, and left no personality to God. In this connection questions were touched upon which will more properly be discussed in the second group of phenomena. An attempt is made to show that the opponents, who think that by means of Hegel's method they can arrive at results different from his, are really employing another method, that Logic does not have to do with forms only, and that the neo-Schellingian opposition of freedom and necessity does away with the former. Finally, a detailed analysis of Fichte's Ontology
is given; and in connection with this the wish is expressed that the philosophy of the real might at last appear, so that we might see what formal philosophy had left for it to say.

§ 333.

1. Amidst all the bitterness with which the strife between the men just mentioned and the Hegelian school was carried on, both of the opposing parties occupied one and the same standpoint, in so far as monism, as expressed by Göschel, was regarded by them as the theory which alone could satisfy the demands of reason. The combatants accordingly considered an opponent as already beaten, when once they had established against him the charge of dualism; as the Peripatetics formerly did in the case of their opponents, when they had shut them up to the doctrine of endless progress. Now, however, men appeared who combated just the very point both parties held fast by. They accordingly made hardly any distinction between Weisse and the Hegelians, but saw similar errors in both, whether they described them according to what they might teach as Pantheists, or according to the sensation they had made, as representatives of the "fashionable" philosophy.

2. Mention may be made first of Carl Friedrich Bachmann (born 1785, died when professor in Jena, 1855), who, at first an enthusiastic follower of Schelling and pupil of Hegel, had shown himself to be in close agreement with both in some lectures which he published under the title of Philosophy and its History (Jena, 1811). In his second work, The Philosophy of our Time (Jena, 1816), he showed that he departed considerably from the ideas of both, until psychological studies and a thorough acquaintance with the Aristotelian Logic brought him to the view that Hegel's influence threatened logic with destruction. The results of these studies were given to the world in his works: On the Hope of a Union between Physics and Psychology (Utrecht, 1821), and the System of Logic (Leipsic, 1828). His work, On Hegel's System and the New Transfiguration of Philosophy (Leipsic, 1833) was the fruit of his conviction with regard to Hegel's influence. In this work fault was found with the presupposition of the identity of thought and being, as being the cardinal error, which was bound to lead and had led to the identification of
logic and metaphysics, and to contempt for empirical knowledge. To the criticism by Hinrichs (Berliner Jahrbücher, May, 1834), as well as to a Circular Letter addressed to him by Rosenkranz, Hegel, A Circular Letter to Dr. C. F. Bachmann (Königsberg, 1834), he replied in his Anti-Hegel (Jena, 1835) in a style for which the jocose tone of Rosenkranz’s Letter had undoubtedly given occasion.

3. Bachmann’s objection to the Hegelian philosophy was, that in laying down being and thought as one, all philosophy was turned into logic. From a different quarter, on the other hand, it was objected, as regards both Hegel and his monistic opponents, that the laying down of all existence as one, led to the theory that all is one, to pantheism in fact. Anton Günther (born on the 17th November, 1783, in Lindenau in Bohemia; died on the 24th February, 1862, in Vienna as a secular priest) is worthy of note on account of the fact that he was the only one who, in this period of the Epigoni, succeeded at once in founding a school. Decisive in this regard was the fact that he had as his associate Johann Heinrich Pabst (born in 1785 in Linda in Eichsfelde; Doctor of Medicine, and for a long time Austrian military surgeon; died in Vienna in 1838); for his own peculiar way of treating everything as a humorist, which reminds us at once of Jean Paul, Hamann, and Baader, but in which he excels all three, extends even to the titles of his works, and would have frightened away many whom Pabst won over to his theory, or at all events whom he filled with respect for it. Günther’s works are: Elements of the Speculative Theology of Positive Christianity (Vienna, 1828–29, 2nd ed., 1846–48), Peregrin’s Banquet (Vienna, 1830), Southern and Northern Lights on the Horizon of Speculative Theology (Vienna, 1832), Janus-heads (edited by himself and Pabst, Vienna, 1834), The Last Creed-maker (Vienna, 1834, on Baur and Möhler), Thomas a Scrupulis (Vienna, 1835, on Weisse and Fichte), The Justice-milieu in German Philosophy (Vienna, 1838), Eurythestus and Hercules (Vienna, 1834), Lydia, a philosophical “Keepsake,” edited in company with Dr. Veith (Vienna, 1849–52). Of works by Pabst there appeared: Man and his History (Vienna, 1830), Is there a Philosophy of Christianity? (Cologne, 1832), Adam and Christ, a Contribution to the Theory of Marriage (Vienna, 1835), besides essays in the Janus-heads and in some Journals. Amongst the men who ranged themselves along
with Günther and Pabst may be mentioned the celebrated preacher Veith, then Carl von Hock (died on the 2nd Jan., 1869, when president of the Oberst Rechnungshof in Vienna). His Cholerodea (Vienna, 1832) is written in imitation of the master in its tone as well as in its ideas, while his Cartesius and his Opponents, but especially his Gerbert, or Pope Silvester II. and his Century, contain some very thorough and purely historical investigations. J. Merten, in his Chief Questions of Metaphysics (Trier, 1840), shows himself a decided follower of Günther. Volkmutth received an impulse from Günther, as is evident from his work, The Trinitarian Pantheism from Thales to Hegel (Cologne, 1837). Later, however, he not only parted company with him, but quite turned against him. Kreuzhage took up a half-friendly position with regard to the School in his Communications on the Influence of Philosophy upon the Development of the Inner Life (Mainz, 1831), and in his work, On the Knowledge of Truth (Münster, 1836). He was evidently helped to his religious philosophy in contrast to "the very logical but erroneous Hegelian philosophy," more by Baader than by Günther. When the works of Oischinger (1852), and Clemens (1853) appeared, attacking Günther's orthodoxy, and which were perhaps designed to evoke a severer Papal decree than the one which actually came forth, Knooht, in Bonn, in his Clemens and Günther (3 vols., Vienna, 1853–54), and Baltzer, in Breslau, in his New Letters to Dr. Anton Günther (Breslau, 1853), came forward simultaneously in opposition to these attacks. Michelis, in his Critique of Günther's Philosophy, Paderborn, 1864, appears certainly as an opponent of Günther, but as a worthy and respectful one, who does not seek to take revenge for the disdainful way in which Günther had treated him. The study of Hegel, especially of his Phaenomenology, had brought Günther as early as the year 1820 to seek in Descartes a protection against what appeared to him the pantheistic teaching of Hegel. He sought this in Descartes just because, after the first period in the process of the comprehension of Christ, the period of the construction of dogmas, had been closed by the Council of Trent, it was Descartes who within the Catholic Church introduced the second period, that of speculative theology. The fact that Descartes takes his stand on self-consciousness would not in itself have afforded him the protection he sought, for it is recognised on all hands that Hegel
does this as well. It was the dualism of Cartesianism, however, which was selected for praise as its supreme merit, as being the peculiarly Christian standpoint, and of which also the transcendentalism of semi-pantheists is a residue. The starting-point in self-consciousness and the dualism are harmonized by means of a proposition which originated with Fichte, a fact which Günther does not recognize. It is as follows: Self-consciousness is not possible without the excitation given by another self-consciousness, an excitation which each man receives from another man, while the first or primitive man receives it from God. It is not so much the not-I, but rather the I-not, which is the indispensable correlate of the Ego. In saying this, however, you already say that the Ego is finite both as regards its appearance and manifestations, and hence limited, and finite also as regards its being, and hence conditioned. From the first statement it further results that I am sacrificed to another, and therefore exist for this other and not for myself. In this way we get what is material, what assumes a bodily form, and I thus find myself in virtue of my limitation to be body. But since I thus find myself, I exist for myself; I am the opposite of matter, namely, spirit. I, as the individual man, am thus a synthesis of body and spirit. As body, I am a part of nature, as spirit, I am a part of the world of spirits. That Descartes posited mere dead extension instead of body, is to be explained as a remnant of the scholastic way of viewing nature. To body belong life and animation, and nature accordingly is something which organizes, which is an effort to reach self-consciousness, and which finally, in sensation, attains to the possession of an inner power of formation that must be called consciousness. Pabst very often calls it self-consciousness, too; Günther does this more rarely, and mostly with the addition of limitations, such as "figurative," and so on. Both, however, employ the formula that, when all is said, there is no existence which is not self-conscious existence, without stating, as Baader had done, that it originated with Fichte. The distinction between absolute and relative self-consciousness rests upon this, that the former posits itself, while the latter finds or comprehends itself. For this reason, accordingly, Pabst declares that one might quite well accept Hegel's Philosophy of Nature. On the other hand, Hegel conceived quite falsely of the relation between spirit and the essence of nature, when
he defined them as stages, i.e., as quantitatively different. On the contrary, they are qualitatively, essentially, different substances, and the denial of their substantial difference brought him too, as it has so many others, to Pantheism, which may take a materialistic as well as a spiritualistic form, as is shown in the instances of Hobbes and Leibnitz. The essence of nature manifests a generic life, a life of the species; spirit, a personal life; and thus also the self-consciousness which we can attribute to nature, and which shows itself, for instance, in instinct, etc., is its and not the consciousness of individuals, while the spirit is for itself, and has consciousness. The thoughts of nature are therefore notions, and hence Hegel was able to conceive of them correctly; and his mistake is only that he has put nature in the place of the totality of being. Thoughts of nature are notions, while on the contrary the thoughts of the spirit are ideas, and therefore both should certainly not be thought of as forms of existence of one and the same essence, but rather, as they are mutually opposed in their essence, so also are they in their manner of working. Nature as the impersonal or generic, manifests emanation (production), spirit manifests immanent working (creation). As from the limited nature of self-consciousness must be inferred the dualism which is in it and in the world, so from its nature as conditioned must be inferred a second dualism which still more directly cuts at the root of Pantheism. By negating the negation which lies in the nature of the finite, we reach the thought of something which is in no way limited or conditioned, and therefore is in every respect the opposite of that from which we started. If we have here different substances bound together in personal unity, so in the other case we have different persons in one substance. If we have in the finite either emanent or immanent activity which are united in man only in time, in God the emanation of the Son is eternally united with the creative activity of the thought of the world, and so on. Just as this inductive analytic path leads us to the opposition of the finite and the infinite, so exactly the same result is reached by the deductive and synthetic path, when it is seen that in the distinction of persons there clearly lies a threefold negation, so that in this way God, by thinking Himself, thinks at the same time what is the negation of the Triune God, the non-Ego of God, which He can posit. Since it is unthinkable that God should think eternally what He might posit and not
actually posit it, the thought of God leads to a real non-Ego of God in which, since in Him emanation and immanence are one, either emanation without immanence, or immanence without emanation manifests itself, and so on. Therefore the world is not, as Pantheism teaches, to be conceived of as an emanation but as a contraposition of God, and hence so far from its being correct to say that God realizes Himself or even comes to consciousness by the creation of the world, we ought on the contrary to maintain, that if God posits Himself He does not produce substances, and if He creates, He does not posit Himself. Those who make God come to self-consciousness or become a person in man, are pantheists, those who hold that there is a gradual increase of consciousness in Him, are semi-pantheists or Pantheists of personality. Monadism constitutes the direct opposite of Pantheism, as for instance the monadism of Herbart, which has no place for God. Christian monotheism is superior to both, and ought in quite a special sense to be called Theism. On account of this contraposition, God, as the manifoldness of essence in formal unity, stands in contrast to this unity of essence which manifests itself in formal manifoldness, that is, the creature. Thus the same result is reached by the regressive and progressive paths, namely, that the Creator and what is created manifest no unity of essence, so that God can be called spirit only in the sense of His not being nature. Strictly taken, there is contained in this statement a spiritualism which is as open to censure as the naturalism of Baader, who places nature in God. In contrast to this, the true philosophy teaches the double dualism between Creator and creature, and within the latter, between nature and spirit. With the exception of his theory of creation, there is no point with which Günther occupies himself so much as the theory of Incarnation, which in his Elements forms a second part to the doctrine of creation, as a first part. In connection with this, the view is strongly maintained that the Incarnation is the completion of Creation, and is therefore not dependent upon the accident of the Fall. The fact that man, as a part of nature, is a generic being and as spirit is a person, renders possible the original sin which was transmitted from the first Adam, as well as the original grace which appears in the second Adam. This emphasizing of the human personality in the God-Man, as well as his divergences from ecclesiastical and scholastic terminology
involved Günther in controversies which have only a theological interest and may be passed over here.

4. Bachmann, who had gone back to Kant, urged the necessity of holding to the dualism of thought and being, and therefore to the separation of logic and metaphysics, while the dualistic school of Vienna, on the other hand, maintained that we must regard existence, not as one, but as various, as God, spirit, nature. Herbart (vide. § 321, 2–8), again, went beyond both in these demands, and his system is accordingly designated by Günther as the diametrical opposite of Pantheism. Up to the time when Moritz Wilhelm Drobisch (born in 1802 at Leipsic, where he is professor of mathematics and philosophy) criticized his psychological works, Herbart had remained quite unnoticed. He now sought,—after his important works had not proved a success,—to give to the world for once a thoroughly weak production, and he really made a hit: The Encyclopedia of Philosophy (1831) was much more read than the Introduction, and was by many even quite confounded with it. Almost contemporaneously with his retirement to Göttingen, it became evident that a Herbertian school was forming. After his death it increased still more, and owing to the almost masonic way in which the members held by each other, it has attained an influence to which many, especially in Austria, can testify. Drobisch, who rightly stands at the head here, issued his Contributions to the Elucidation of Herbart’s System of Philosophy (Leipsic, 1834), A New Account of Logic (Leipsic, 1836), Questionum Mathematico-Psychologicarum, Fasc. V. (Leipsic, 1836), Elements of the Philosophy of Religion (Leipsic, 1840), Empirical Psychology (1841), and First Principles of Mathematical Psychology (1850). Griezenkerl wrote, Letters to a Young Scholastic Friend on Philosophy and especially on the Doctrines of Herbart (Brunswick, 1832). Roër in Berlin wrote, On Herbart’s Method of Relations (1834). Strümpel wrote, Explanations of Herbart’s Philosophy (1834), The Main Points in Herbart’s Metaphysics (Brunswick, 1840), and later, when professor in Dorpat, compends on Logic, Ethics, University Studies, and the History of Philosophy. Hartenstein (born 1808, for a long time professor in Leipsic) wrote Problems and Principles of General Metaphysics (Leipsic, 1836), On the Most Recent Estimates of the Philosophy of Herbart (1838), and The Fundamental Conceptions of the Ethical Sciences (Leipsic, 1844). If.
following the example of the master, a polemic was carried on in all these works against the Hegelian method, especially against the important place assigned in it to contradiction, which Herbart teaches should be avoided, while Hegel “takes pleasure in it,” Allihn, Exner, and in part also Taute, appeared to see in these attacks almost their one object in life. Owing to Exner’s influence, the Austrian professors in particular went over to the school of Herbart, the most distinguished names amongst whom are at present those of Zimmerman, Lott, and (until lately) of Volkmann.

5. As the Berliner Jahrbücher had served to defend the Hegelians against the attacks of the metaphysicians who thought on monistic lines, so also it was of service in defending them against the attacks of dualistic and pluralistic thinkers. Hinrich’s criticism of Bachmann, whom Schaller, too, noticed in his book mentioned in the previous section, has been already referred to. A companion to it is to be found in the critique of Feuerbach, whose notice of Rosenkranz’s Circular Letter to Bachmann (April 1835) has far more to do with the person addressed than with the writer of the Letter. The Vienna dualistic school was repeatedly noticed in the Jahrbücher. Of all the criticisms, that by Rosenkranz (August 1831) on Günther’s Elements, on Peregrians Banquet, and Pabst’s Man and his History, turned out to be the least favourable. Marheineke (December, 1832) expressed himself in a much more friendly way regarding the work, Is there a Philosophy of Christianity? and Göschel (May, 1834) wrote in a particularly friendly tone on Adam and Christ (January, 1836), and on the Janus-heads. In both criticisms it was recognised that this dualism much more closely resembled the Hegelian monism than certain forms of a crude pantheism which were making a stir at the time. Feuerbach, it is true, expressed a different opinion in a criticism of Hock’s Cartesius (April, 1836), whom he did not forgive in particular for having emphasized the Catholicism of Descartes. In reference, finally, to the Herbartian school, it may be said that Herbart’s Encyclopedia was criticized by Hinrichs in a way which showed that he had not wholly forgotten that the Hegel whom Herbart frequently classed amongst the “fashionable” philosophers, and who found pleasure in contradictions, had been his revered teacher and paternal friend. On the other hand, there appeared a general critique by Weisse of the first
works of Drobisch, of the works of Roër, and of some of the principal works of Herbart which had appeared at an earlier time. Weisse rightly recognised that in this point his cause was identical with that of the Hegelians. He here seeks to prove that the system of Herbart, in seeking to escape from the principle of contradiction, places itself on the standpoint of the abstract understanding, and thus puts itself outside of the number of all really speculative systems.

§ 334.

1. In spite of this contrast, which Weisse had shown to exist between Herbart and all the systems hitherto mentioned, there was still a standpoint, considered from which, Herbart and the "fashionable" philosophers whom he combated, might be regarded as labouring under a perfectly similar error, inasmuch as they wished above all to be metaphysicians. This standpoint, with which, in its purity at all events, Germany up till that time had not been acquainted, since its influence on the German spirit had given rise partly to the realistically coloured eclecticism of the popular philosophy (§ 294, 3), and partly to criticism (§ 298, 1), found a representative in Friedrich Eduard Beneke (born on the 17th Feb., 1798, at Berlin, where when extraordinary Professor he was drowned, or, as was thought, drowned himself, on the 1st March, 1854). Already in his first works: The Doctrine of Cognition (Jena, 1820), The Doctrine of Mental Experience as the Basis for all Knowledge (Berlin, 1820), and the New First Principles of Metaphysics (Berlin, 1822), he took up a position of decided antagonism to every philosophy which pretended to be anything more than an attempt to make intelligible by means of hypotheses what had been discovered by observation. In consequence of the appearance of his Elements of the Physics of Morals, which was issued in 1822, the authorities did Hegel, who disliked him, the favour of removing him from his chair as a lecturer. Hegel's acquiescence in this act is a blot upon his memory. Beneke, suddenly become famous, owing to this incident, went to Göttingen, after publishing a Defence of the work attacked, and Contributions to a Purely Mental Scientific Treatment of the Diseases of the Mind (both Leipsic, 1824). During the time that he was lecturer at Göttingen, he published his principal
work on psychology, *Psychological Sketches* (2 vols., 1825–27), and *The Relation Between Body and Soul* (1826). On his return to Berlin, besides his adaptation of Bentham's *First Principles of Civil and Criminal Legislation* (Berlin, 1830), he published in quick succession his Jubilee memoir on the *Critique of Pure Reason* (*Kant and the Philosophical Problem of our Time*, Berlin, 1832), his *Logic*, 1832 (which appeared in a more extended form as *The System of Logic*, in two volumes, Berlin, 1842), *Philosophy in its Relation to Experience, to Speculation, and to Life* (Berlin, 1833), and his *Handbook of Psychology as a Science of Nature* (Berlin, 1833). (When this last-mentioned work appeared in a second edition in the year 1845, Beneke published along with it his *New Psychology*, a series of essays in which, among other things, he discusses his relation to other psychologists). This work was followed by *The Theory of Education and Instruction*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1835–36 (2nd ed. 1842), together with the *Elucidations*, etc., which belong to it (Berlin, 1836), and next, *Our Universities*, etc. (1836). Then appeared the *Outlines of the Theory of Morals* (2 vols., 1837, 1840), and the *Outlines of Natural Law* (1838), which remained unfinished. These together made up the outlines of the natural system of practical philosophy. There next appeared the *System of Metaphysics and Philosophy of Religion* (1840), and the *Reform and Standing of our Schools* (1848). The *Pragmatic Psychology* (1850), the *Archive for Pragmatic Psychology* (in the years 1851–53), and the *Handbook of Pragmatic Psychology* seek to make psychology as thus placed on a new basis, fruitful in its effects on practical life. Besides the writings here referred to, Beneke wrote a large number of criticisms, especially on foreign philosophy and on German psychological works. He was a frequent contributor to several periodicals.


2. Beneke had often declared,—in the Jubilee Memoir among other places,—that in true philosophy the English, the French, and even the Italians were in advance of us, because we had not so thoroughly broken with Scholasticism as they had. Our philosophy had remained speculation; that is to say, it cherished the delusion that existence can be comprehended by means of conceptions, with which there was at
the same time closely connected the false view that the right method is that according to which the particular is deduced from the universal. Bacon had already pointed to the right course in what he says of experience and the inductive method; and the English and French philosophers had, at any rate, never forgotten that philosophy ought to be a comprehending of what is real. Among the Germans, Kant, by his strict analyses and happy syntheses, has won for himself a meritorious position. His greatest merit, however, namely the limitation of knowledge to the sphere of experiences, as well as his appeal to the ordinary moral consciousness, has been forgotten by his followers, and only what survived of the scholasticism under which his teaching laboured has been further developed. This was done by Fichte more than by any one else, and he was essentially the originator of all the errors and extravagances from which German philosophy has suffered since his day. Schelling, who supplemented his ideas, and Hegel, who went back to him, followed the same course. The only philosophers who at least gave hints of something better were Änesidemus-Schulze and Jacobi, because they approached to the views of the Scotch school. Philosophy is a pure science of experience, and differs from Physics only in so far as it rests on inner experience. The matter with which it deals, accordingly, is constituted by what is given in consciousness. It must always place itself at the point of view of the ordinary consciousness, and differs from the latter only in that it analyses the highly complicated processes of which it consists into their simplest ingredients, and synthetically joins together again into a system what presents itself in the ordinary consciousness as isolated. Just because it attaches itself to inner experience, philosophy is safe from the extremes of sensualism and materialism; and here it recognises that Kant was justified in conceiving of all that is given in external experience as appearance. On the other hand, we must regard it as thorough-going scepticism when Kant, by his false view of the inner sense, ends by calling also the individual soul simply an appearance. We ought rather to extend to the entire self, to the entire soul, what Schopenhauer says of will. It is only our soul which we know as it is in itself; and Descartes felt this when he maintained that the soul is better known to us than what is perceived by means of the senses. What is thus perceived contains distorting additions supplied by sense, and is there-
fore not perceived as it is. Such an addition is present, for instance, when we see and touch, in the form of space, or extension in length, breadth, and depth. When Kant took this as a form of every external sense, he forgot that neither what is smelt nor what is tasted is long, broad, and deep. Still less is this the case with the immediately perceived soul, which has no where, that is, which is immaterial, for by the material we understand what exists in space. In this way, not only is the absurdity of the coarser form of materialism laid bare, but also the error of those who, in order to explain mental processes always have recourse to bodily processes, and would thus elucidate what is better known to us by means of what is more unknown. On the contrary, since there is, to begin with, no single presentation in which the real nature of what is presented is known, except that of the individual psychical being, we must start from it in the attempt to press on to the knowledge of the unknown; and first of all, therefore, from the knowledge of our bodily existence, that is, of ourselves as appearance, or as what is extended. The circumstance that there is no bodily development which cannot on occasion become a conscious (psychical) one, ought itself to be a hint that what we perceive of our body by means of the senses and commonly call our body, might be only a sign, or something representative of an inner being of the body behind this, or a being of the body in itself, which might consist of forces different certainly from those which constitute the soul, but still of forces which would be similar to these. The certainty of the existence of the individual psychical self united with the perceptions of the individual bodily existence, brings us, further, to the certainty of the existence of other souls similar to ourselves, a certainty which is grounded in analogy. From bodily existence, when once known, we shall be able again to mount further to what is pure body, in which we must in the same way suppose the existence of forces which form the ground of its appearance, i.e., the existence of something that is akin to souls or spirit. When Beneke and his admirers call this view Spiritualism, because bodily existence is here explained from forces of a spiritual kind, in contrast to the diametrically opposed procedure of the materialists, and boast that while materialism sees in the soul something corporeal endowed with potency, according to their view the body is subordinated to what is spiritual, they perhaps too entirely
forgot that the difference between \( a = b^n \) and \( b = \sqrt[n]{a} \) is not very great. It is certain, however, that by adopting this view the influence of the body on the soul and vice versa, and particularly the signification for the soul of sleep, can be much more easily explained than they can be from many other standpoints. What is really characteristic and new in Beneke’s standpoint is to be seen far less in his position with regard to materialism and spiritualism than, as he has always himself expressed it, in the fact that he regards psychology as the starting-point and foundation of philosophy. By psychology he means what he calls the new psychology—new, that is, because, avoiding the wrong paths hitherto taken, it follows wholly the example of science; and, exactly as science does, searches out the laws for the given facts, and for the laws, what makes them intelligible. With such a psychologism—as we would prefer to name his theory—it must appear to him an absurdity that Herbart should base psychology on metaphysics. The latter, on the contrary, like all other philosophical sciences, is only applied psychology. Logical right and wrong, the beautiful and the ugly, the moral and the immoral, everything in short which may be a problem for Philosophy, is first given as a psychical act, or as an image in the soul. When we clearly understand what form these images have, and the way in which they originate in all men, we possess a Logic, an Æsthetics, and an Ethics. But just on this account it will be fitting in describing Beneke’s theory not only, as will at once be understood, to consider his psychology first; but, as was done in the case of Kant, where, in § 299, 5, the Metaphysics of Nature was taken along with the Transcendental Analytic, and in § 300, 6, that of Morals with the Transcendental Dialectic, to insert always at the point in his psychology to which he attaches his account of another part of his system, a short sketch of the same.

3. Those who wished to go into his theory were referred by Beneke himself when they asked about it, to the Sketches and the Handbook as the chief sources of his Psychology. He thus left it to each reader to judge according to his liking whether the full but more aphoristic account given in the former of these books, or the shorter but more systematic account given in the latter, was the best with which to begin. We shall confine ourselves here mainly to the Handbook. Locke and Herbart are recognised in this work as the pioneers of modern philosophy; the former, because he demolished
innate ideas, the latter, because he demolished the old theory of faculties of the mind. Unfortunately, with what Locke accomplished there was connected the error of supposing the soul to be a *tabula rasa*, and with what was done by Herbart that of supposing the soul to be simple, something to which no faculties at all were to be attributed. On the contrary, nothing takes place in the soul in such a way as to leave it quite passive. The stimulus given is accompanied by an act of reception or appropriation. As this, like everything that takes place, must have a force or faculty for its cause, and, since, further, different stimuli are received, we are bound to suppose that there are many original forces or original faculties in the soul which are its elementary constituent parts. We must suppose that there are already in each sense many such faculties for receiving stimuli, so that there is all the less reason for regarding the soul as simple. In order to get at these original faculties, it is necessary first of all to carry the given facts back to certain fundamental laws which govern all that happens. These are discovered by reasoning deductively from the complex processes of the soul in its natural state. It thus becomes evident that where the satisfying stimulus meets with the hungering receptivity which corresponds to it, sensuous sensations, that is, psychical elements arise, into which the stimuli have been converted. Further, as is proved by the fact of receptivity for new stimuli, new original faculties are constantly being acquired by the soul, or, what is the same thing, accrue to it. The soul shows at a later stage a faculty for receiving an impression which at an earlier stage it was not able to receive. The product of the stimuli and of the original faculties, of the first, as well as of those which grow up afterwards, may be called an act or creation of the soul. Since in such a product the two factors are sometimes more firmly sometimes less firmly bound together, *i.e.* are movable, we reach a third fundamental law of the psychical life, namely that the movable elements of all mental creations mutually strive to balance each other, and to flow over into each other. The fact of the reproduction of presentations which had vanished, proves that the universal law of nature, according to which what has once arisen continues to exist, until in consequence of the operation of special causes it is again destroyed, holds good in reference to the creations which arise in the soul. This fact is explained by the third fundamental law, that what
has been consciously perceived can allow so much of its movable elements to be left over that this residue remains in the soul as an unconscious element, or as a trace. Because it contains the possibility of being reproduced, and because this possibility is something which has arisen gradually, it may for this reason, in order to distinguish it from the germ, be called a rudimentary something which has been made what it is. Trace, therefore, or the rudimentary something which has been made what it is, is just the same thing thought of in a different relation, that is, as turned backwards or forwards. Exactly in the same way as the original faculties before they have received the impression make an effort towards it, and after they have received the impression make an effort to go after it, the creation of the soul which has become a trace, that is, something between production and reproduction, remains in the soul in the form of effort, so that the soul essentially consists simply of efforts, of a pure striving. The union, partly of conscious psychical creations, and partly of the traces, in themselves and among each other, is referred to the fourth and last fundamental law, according to which the creations of the soul attract each other in proportion to their similarity, or strive after a closer union in the points in which they resemble each other. We have experience of the validity of this law in the case of witty combinations of ideas, in the formation of comparisons, and the like. Besides the original faculties and those four fundamental processes, we must lay down as originally innate only the varied power, animation, and capacity to receive impressions, which belong to these. All other differences, such as those of talent and genius, have arisen out of, and are to be deduced from, the combination of those elementary creations of the soul. The powers and faculties of the soul in its matured state consist only of traces of formations previously caused, and may therefore be constructed from these. Conversely, we may reason from them back to the original essence of the soul. By following this latter method we are able to determine the difference between the human soul and the soul of the brute, as consisting in the spirituality of the former, i.e., in its clearer or more comprehensive consciousness. By this is not to be understood something original or innate, but something which has come to be what it is. It is thus not something absolutely different from the unconscious or what is not yet conscious,
but only something which has gradually become different, *i.e.*, it is that stage and clearness of presentation, feeling, etc., which corresponds to the excitability, or to the strength of the psychical being itself. Animals never raise themselves to this stage, and children only when they are older; and it is impossible exactly to define the point at which what is close to consciousness actually gives place to consciousness.

4. For the attainment of the stage of clearness denominated consciousness, what Beneke calls the constructive forms of the soul, are of the utmost importance. By these he understands the different relations in which the two factors of the one psychical act or creation may stand to each other. He distinguishes five such forms. Where the stimulus is too slight, the faculty which appropriates it makes an effort to reach a higher realization of its nature, and the result is a feeling of dissatisfaction. The suitability of the stimulus to satisfy the faculty gives the sensations and ordinary perceptions or, speaking more generally, the fundamental form of presentation. An extraordinary fulness in the stimulus gives the fundamental relation which constitutes sensations of pleasure. A gradual increase in the stimulus until it reaches excess, gives the fundamental form of satiety or blunted appetite; and, finally, a sudden excess in the stimulus gives the sensation of pain. Of these constructive forms, the presentations most quickly and most easily reach the stage of clearness which we call consciousness. Accordingly, the products of presentation are treated first and in greatest detail, while the others, the emotional products or products of moods, are treated further on and far less fully. The distinction between these two establishes the distinction between theoretical and practical procedure, which, however, does not justify us in referring without further ado the highly complicated processes of thought and will which appear in the soul in its maturity, back to two imaginary faculties, as ancient philosophy does. There are no such faculties, any more than there is a *fuga vacui* in nature. As this has been forgotten, since we have gone back to the simplest processes which lie at the basis of the more complicated, it is time to banish the faculties also, which are only hypostatized class notions of phenomena very closely combined, and to make an attempt to show whether these processes may not be explained from stimuli, traces, and the excess of their elements. Beneke first makes this attempt when he comes to consider the production
and reproduction of single sensations and perceptions; and he reaches the conclusion that, instead of speaking of one power of memory, we must rather attribute to each presentation a memory of its own, i.e., the active effort it makes towards reproduction. The same holds good of the powers of recollection and imagination, words to which a rational meaning can be attached only when, in the case of memory, we think of those reproductions in which it is their strength, in the case of recollection, of those in which it is their liveliness, in the case of imagination, of those in which it is the susceptibility of receiving impressions, that is the assisting gift of nature. (Here at all events, as also elsewhere, he confines the differences of innate endowments within very narrow limits.) In the second and third chapters of the Manual, where the production and reproduction of presentations are discussed, reference is constantly made to the emotional constructive forms, because moods, too, are reproduced, and desire is just remembrance of sensations of pleasure. In the fourth and fifth chapters, however, where the combinations of the separate products are discussed, Beneke draws a much sharper distinction. The first of these two chapters treats of the combinations of similar presentations into notions, and supplies the foundation on which he constructs his System of Logic. While he defines thought as the object of logic, he separates the psychological and the logical treatment of thought in such a way that the former simply describes what takes place in thought, while the latter also maintains the ideal point of view and shows what ought to take place, and is thus an art. It defends itself against the charge of giving laws which have no foundation in fact, by taking up and solving its problems in a psychological and genetic way. It is accordingly first shown, that similar presentations by being fused together attain to such a strength and clearness that they become notions, the possession of which is what we call understanding. As they themselves contain only what entered into them from the particular presentations during that process of fusion, it follows that Understanding and the doctrine of thought have essentially to do with what is produced from these presentations, and will therefore not pretend to deduce the particular from the notions. In the course followed by the Logic we get three principal parts. In the first Part are discussed the forms which are peculiar to thought, notion, judgment and syllogism. The second Part
treats of what is contributed by the rudiments of cognition, and also of what thought constructs out of these rudiments, i.e., it treats of the rudiments and the development of cognition. In order to complete both investigations, the cases are collected together in which thought and knowledge are in close connection with something different from themselves; i.e., the co-operation of the internal and external elements is considered. In connection with the first part, which corresponds to what is otherwise known as elementary doctrine, it is to be observed that Beneke does not identify the fusion of presentations into notions with judgment, and therefore he censures those who insist that we ought to begin with the judgment. He further holds, that in every judgment the predicate-notion is already contained in the presentation which the subject forms, and that it is thus analytic. Finally, he declares that the theory of the syllogistic figures hitherto held rests too much on purely verbal distinctions, while the view that the substitution which we call syllogism can only take place where the new element in no way exceeds the old, and is therefore the same as it is, or a part of it, supplies a thoroughly regular schematism, and presents in a clear light the growth of syllogisms. The most important result reached is, that by means of all those forms new matter or content is never added, but only a greater clearness in the presentations is gained. How we get at matter or content is shown in the second principal Part, the doctrine of knowledge. This, in contrast to analysis, which makes the process of knowledge clear, treats of the syntheses which add to our knowledge; but just for this reason it often wanders aside into metaphysical investigations. Induction, the deductive syllogism, hypotheses, and, finally, scientific methods, constitute the outstanding subjects here. The third principal Part, which treats of the united life of thought and knowledge, attempts first to comprehend thought as determined, that is as being, and therefore in its objective relation, or as cognition. From this it goes on to treat more directly of the different perfections of cognition, universality, universal validity and necessity. With this part of the subject he connects the investigations into the organization of science and the relation of knowledge and faith. The development of thought on its subjective side is then discussed, advice given in reference to the acquisition and growth of the powers of thought, and the
principal hindrances thereto examined. References to what has been already developed serve as a foundation here.

5. Just as the investigations in the fourth chapter had afforded the foundation for logic, so in the fifth chapter of the Manual, Beneke seeks to lay the foundation of Metaphysics, which is also treated by him in a special work. As the notion, i.e., the combination of similar presentations, constituted the starting-point for logic, so metaphysics has to do with what springs from the combination of dissimilar presentations, that is, from groups and series of presentations. Here, more than in any other part of philosophy, the close connection between it and psychology comes into view. To begin with, the very first fundamental problem of Metaphysics, which is concerned with the relation of presentation to being, can be solved only by the aid of psychology. The objections of idealism are too weighty to allow of our supposing, with ordinary realism, that our mental representation contains exactly the same as is contained in existence. On the other hand, the "full" idealism is equally untenable, both in the form in which it is held by Kant, who doubts if any being exists for us at all, and in the form in which it is held by Fichte, who denies that there is any such being. Since notions are not invented, but constructed out of presentations, the fact that we have a notion of being is a proof that a being at all events is given to us. That is our own Self; and it is shown above how, starting from this, we can be sure, not indeed by a process of reasoning, but instinctively and always in an indirect way, of the existence of other persons, and further of things without a self. It is pointed out that we thus have, not knowledge of effects only, or, are not confined to the knowledge of phenomena, but possess knowledge of being, or know the In-itself; and thus the possibility of metaphysics is proved. After solving this problem, the Metaphysics (Second Part) has to investigate the forms and relations which lay claim to reality. Among these the most important are, first, the universal fundamental relation of the thing and its qualities (substance and accidents), and connected with this, space and time, which have more of an external character, and causal relations, which have a more internal and active character. With reference, now, to the first of these relations, the relation of things within each other, it is shown that we have in the self, of which alone we possess a metaphysically
true knowledge, a collection (of original faculties, capacities, etc.). This we transfer to the external world in such a way as to suppose hypothetically that in the appearance of things related within each other there exists an analogous being-for-itself with internal relations, and thus we distinguish between substance and accidents, i.e., whole and parts, or the permanent and changing. In connection with the unity given in ourselves, is discussed the important psycho-metaphysical problem of the Ego; and it is shown that although what presents the idea, as well as the idea presented, are continually changing, one thing remains constant, the fact, namely, that they are both one. This identity, which arises late in the process, is to be regarded as what is really permanent. There is no contradiction whatever in it. Just as, in connection with this first fundamental relation, Beneke directly and indirectly carries on a constant polemic against the positions of Herbart, so he does against Kant, when he comes to space and time. The necessary nature of the idea of space does not prove that it exists in us a priori, prior to all experience, for ideas which have been originated can also become so firmly fixed in the mind that they cannot be got rid of. It is quite incorrect to speak of one external sense, since there are five, of which only two allow us to conceive of their objects as extended, and lead us to get by abstraction from many extended things the notion of extension, which, it is true, precedes all (new) experiences, but itself originates from perception. It further follows from this, that sight and touch turn what is perceived into something extended; but it does not follow at all that all objective reality starts from space. Our self-consciousness informs us of a real (though, to be sure, not spatial) co-existence (of presentations, etc.), in ourselves, and there is much which seems to support the idea that there is likewise in things in themselves something akin to this, but which becomes spatial to the perceiving subject. Kant was brought both by his false theory of an inner sense as well as by his love of symmetry to class time along with space. On the contrary, succession is the form of all that takes place, both of phenomenal existence and of existence-in-itself, which we perceive in ourselves. As the views of Herbart and Kant were combated in the explanation given of these two relations, the views of Hume are combated in connection with the third relation, that of causality. The fact that we make ideas pre-
sent to our minds, proves that we *are* causality; and thus there is constituted this relation to an inner given something, which, exactly as in the case of inference mentioned above, is then, by a process of transference, hypothetically assumed to be in existence external to ourselves, and in which we see succession in time. The fact, however, that the very first time we have these ideas we do not doubt but that it is we who call them into existence, refutes Hume's theory of habit. Although Beneke has often declared that religion does not rest on a purely theoretical basis, but on a practical and æsthetical basis as well, he has nevertheless incorporated his philosophy of religion with the *Metaphysics* as a third Part. Therewith, the question, in how far we have in religion a real knowledge, *i.e.*, a knowledge with an objective basis, is brought to the foreground. Since the philosophy of religion, like philosophy in general, must be limited to what is of universal human value, any reference to positive religions is of course excluded, and the investigation is confined to the question of the existence and essence of God, and to the immortality of the soul. The latter investigation, just because the soul is actually given us in experience, lies closer at hand, and is the easier of the two, and therefore we begin with it. It shows that the materialistic objections to the immortality of the soul are by no means convincing, because from the decay of the external life of the soul no conclusion can be drawn in reference to the inner (unconscious) being of the soul; and the dependence of the soul on the body may very appropriately be compared to that of the plant upon the soil from which it draws its nourishment. In the latter case it is by no means impossible that a plant, if transferred to a different soil, may continue to grow, or even that something new may spring from it through its becoming a productive soil itself. In reference, finally, to the knowledge of God, Beneke is never tired of extolling Kant for having demonstrated the impossibility of reaching the truth of the existence of God by means of notions. But since God is not given in experience, the question arises: From what that is given in experience are we to start, if our thought is to carry us to the First Cause of all being? The answer is, From the fragmentary character of all that is given. This necessitates the supposition of something that is of the nature of a complement, and the attachment to this of predicates which are derived partly from being in general, partly
from nature, and partly from ourselves. Neither materialism nor pantheism can accomplish what is best attained by means of theism, which, it is true, is satisfied with the confession that in this matter very little can be known, and that there is thus all the more left to be believed and expected. Our beliefs and hopes regarding the existence of God are based especially on feelings, among which the feeling of dependence is not religion, but is much rather that above which religion raises us.

6. As the doctrine of the fusion and grouping of presentations formed the psychological foundation for logic and metaphysics, as the principal parts of theoretical philosophy, so we find a foundation for the remaining parts of philosophy, and especially for Practical Philosophy and Aesthetics, in what is taught regarding the combinations of the emotional constructive forms, or constructive forms of mental moods. Of these the impulses precede (chap. 6) the feelings (chap. 7) in the Manual, while the Sketches begin with the natural theory of the feelings. As Beneke had hitherto always opposed to the theory of an innate understanding, etc., which produces notions, the theory that memory first originates with the individual reminiscences, and understanding with the notions, and that they consist of these reminiscences and notions, so he now denies the existence of any innate faculty of desire or feeling. The impulses or efforts, such as the original faculties and capacities had proved themselves to be, become desire by means of the recollections of pleasure, and desire again becomes volition when a series of presentations is attached to it in which, what is desired is represented as realized. The sum of the separate volitions is called will, which is therefore to be deduced from them, and not they from it. The origin of volition, of inclinations, of general principles, and so on, in the elementary formations of the soul, supplies the foundation for practical philosophy. Here, however, at the same time, those feelings are to be examined which are distinguished from the other creations of the soul by the fact that they do not consist so much of single acts, but are rather the immediate consciousness of a relation. They reveal to us, that is, the contrast between our mental condition and any creation of the soul (the basis of feeling); and the more striking this contrast is, the stronger they are. Like the presentations and desires, the feelings too are only combinations of the original
faculties. All three are distinguished from each other by the fact that in the origin of the first it is their force which is the determining factor, in that of the second their liveliness, and in that of the third their susceptibility to stimulus. The feelings which form the psychological basis for the aesthetic notions are of equal importance for practical philosophy, since they make what is morally beautiful and elevated intelligible to us. It is in them in fact that the moral relations first reveal themselves, and only later that from them spring moral conceptions, then moral judgments, and finally the system to which these all belong, namely the moral law. To begin with the latter, which is the most complicated of all the elements, is absurd. The very first question therefore to be established is, According to what standard do we estimate the value of things? Only according to the intensification and depression of the psychical products which are occasioned by them. We prefer what intensifies our desires, etc. This is in the first place a purely subjective standard of valuation. We ascribe objective value to what, in the course of natural development, has been universally and by all men held to be of value. Accordingly, it holds good objectively, that the sensations of sight have more value than those of taste, that the exercise of the intellect is superior to indulgence in the pleasures of sense, and so on. Just because this preference is based in the very nature of the soul, it announces itself to us as a compulsory duty which, as has been remarked, is first felt, and is then grasped as an idea. But we must be careful here, too, not to invent an innate moral feeling or indeed law. Moral feeling, conscience, and so on, have arisen according to the universal law of development. If in accordance with what was once the prevailing linguistic usage, we call the highest development of thought and of volition, reason, then the moral law can be described as a demand of reason. Only we must not forget here, either, that reason is not anything innate, but that it consists only in the possession of the clearest thoughts, the purest feelings, the most worthy volitions; that man, therefore, is not a rational being, but is in process of becoming such.

7. From a standpoint from which, in the case of all the investigations made, we are led to the result that what is generally regarded as innate has come to be, or has been made to be what it is, education must necessarily be considered
of the highest importance, seeing that its aim is to make men rational. This accounts not only for the industry and care which Beneke has himself bestowed upon his Theory of Education and Instruction, but also for the acceptance which his theories found, especially among educationalists. Among these, no one has contributed more to spreading the fame of his master than Dressler. Ueberweg, too (died when professor in Königsberg on the 9th Jan., 1871), has been pointed out as one upon whom Beneke's educational theories in particular had a lasting influence. He shows, however, that he was influenced by Beneke in other subjects, as appears especially in his treatment of logic. If the educationalists gladly welcomed a doctrine which promised them an unbounded field of activity—since, according to it, there were no longer any innate talents or genius, no evil dispositions, etc., and that at most, nothing remained but differences of temperament,—those too, whose religious needs found satisfaction only where the self-activity of man is reduced to a minimum, namely, in pietism, considered it a doctrine which they might well adopt. They did this all the more readily, as Beneke had always spoken against valuing too highly the Notion, and had in religious matters left so much room for faith and anticipation at the expense of knowledge. Odd as it may now seem, the hatred felt against the Hegelian "deification of the Notion," actually led many well-known theologians to designate as "Christian Philosophy" works in which the sensationalism of Beneke was blended with pietism. This happened, among other instances, in the case of Eduard Schmidt (died when Professor in Rostock), when he published his work, On the Absolute and Conditioned, (Rostock, 1834), which in many points reminds us of Poiret, (§ 278, 4), though no such excuse can be made for it as for the work of Poiret, who did not yet know the consequences of the empiricism he was the first to prepare for. The Outlines of a History of Philosophy, which Schmidt afterwards wrote (Berlin, 1839), were meant to show how the blunder of turning philosophy into speculation has only had the negative use of bringing it face to face with an empiricism which renounces everything a priori. This latter work was warmly welcomed by Beneke, as a proof that there were still thinkers who did not side with the fashionable folly of speculation.

8. It was not to be expected that also these attacks upon the whole post-Kantian philosophy should remain unanswered.
on the part of the Hegelian school. Beneke was criticized first by Schmidt in Erfurt (February, 1833), then by Hinrichs (December, 1834). The former charged him with misunderstanding Kant, with ingratitude for what had been done by Kant's successors, and with un-German exaltation of foreign second-rate wisdom. The latter sought to prove to him that, without knowing it, he had employed a number of categories which did not in any way originate in experience. The author of the present work criticized (September, 1834) Schmidt's above-mentioned work, and attempted to prove that the separation of the object and the idea of it, when carried to such an extreme, does not only make knowledge impossible, but also involves a number of contradictions. These replies had of course special reference to the points in which Hegel's teaching had been attacked. The School did not pay any attention to what was original in the psychologism of Beneke, or at least did not pay sufficient attention to it. The foregoing account is an attempt to make good this injustice, hence its fulness. If, in connection with this, points have been mentioned which have nothing whatever to do with the Hegelian school, and which therefore belong to the second part of this Appendix, the excuse offered is, that to have separated subjects which Beneke treats of together, would have resulted in useless repetitions.

9. Alongside of Beneke, OTTO FRIEDRICH GRUPPE is to be mentioned, not in order to signify thereby how he reached his views, but because of the points of contact which, as he has himself avowed, exist between his views and those of Beneke. Born at Danzig in the year 1804, he was for many years connected, as Secretary, with the Berlin Academy of Art, an office which he retained until his death in the year 1876. Although during his student days an assiduous attendant of Hegel's lectures, he was never an adherent of his teaching. (In the anonymously published comedy, The Winds, which is a brilliant piece of persiflage on Hegel, some pretended that they recognised the co-operation of Lachmann, to whom Gruppe had at an early period attached himself.) A many-sided culture enabled Gruppe to appear as an author in connection with a large variety of subjects. His works, On the Tragic Art of the Greeks (1834), On the Roman Elegy (1838), On the Fragments of Archytas (1840); the two brochures, On Academic Freedom of Teaching (1842-43), and those, On
the Cosmic Systems of the Greeks (1852), do not come under consideration here. His Antätus, however, which appeared shortly before Hegel's death in 1831, his Turning-point of Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century (1834), and his work written at Schelling's death, Present and Future of Philosophy in Germany (1855), may be referred to. In all three works the author occupies the same standpoint. Not only does he assert towards the close of the second, that all that it contains had been already said in the Antätus, but the eleventh section of the third work, written a quarter of a century after the first, contains over again in a clear and complete summary the principal thoughts to be found in the two others. Although in the Antätus, which is a correspondence between an enthusiastic young Hegelian and an older man who represents Gruppe's views, the attack is directed against the chief points of the Hegelian system, the Method, the Logic, the Philosophy of Nature, the Philosophy of History, the Philosophy of Religion and the History of Philosophy, still the sole aim of the book is not to combat this system, indeed that can scarcely be called its principal aim. Rather, it is the whole of speculative philosophy, and metaphysics in particular, which are combated in the Hegelian system, as representing their culminating point. By metaphysics he understands the attempt to create knowledge out of pure notions, whether by the aid of logical syllogisms or by construction. Although this attempt is not new, but is almost as old as philosophy itself—the history of which is a history of error with occasional flashes of light—none the less, it is pure nonsense, and therefore speculative philosophy constitutes the diametrical opposite of science. The evil course was taken when the Eleatics declared war against what can be perceived by the senses; a great advance in error was made when Plato stamped as the only reality the specific ideas gained by abstraction; and then Aristotle quite logically declared that erroneous form of thought which passes from the universal to the particular, to be true knowledge. In the period which followed upon this, Aristotle held sway for centuries by means of his Organon, and thus the error referred to also continued to hold sway; and it continued to do so even after, in the writings of Bacon, one of those rare flashes of light had broken in upon the history of philosophy. Many circumstances unite to make it intelligible, even to make it excusable, that the philosophers of antiquity
should have come to hold such absurd views. To begin with, their science of nature was in the highest degree defective, and especially the almost complete absence of experiment in their investigations made it well-nigh impossible for them to take up a right attitude towards the methods followed by the investigator of nature. Then the Greek knew only a single language, and his own belonged to those which may be called concrete, in which, owing to the close cohesion of words originally separate, the wealth of grammatical forms prevents us from seeing the copulative parts which have revealed to our comparative science of language, the mysterious essence of language. This once discovered, any one can now recognise it, if he watches how our children learn to speak. Finally, the circumstance that Pythagoras, Plato, and others were great mathematicians, occasioned their belief that what was warranted within the sphere of mathematics held good outside of it also, a belief which was injurious to the interests of truth. With regard to this distinction, the matter stands thus: all abstract notions are expressions which help us to state our meaning, are abbreviations which are adopted as giving facilities for calculation, and they are verbally expressed in order that these notions may be communicated. Just for this reason, they are only signs for values, but have no value in themselves, and ought to be applied only in so far as they still remain in relation to the concrete, from which they have been got by a process of abstraction. (The healthy human understanding is well aware of this, and accordingly fills up the expression which is always inadequate, and does this differently according to different circumstances. "Large" means something quite different according as it is understood of a man or of a house.) When this relativity of notions is forgotten, and when they are taken as something complete and absolute, we have the error which is called ignorantia elenchi. Geometry, because it applies conceptions only within the small sphere of spatial quantity, never loses sight of them, and so never falls into this error, but errs only because it does so confine itself. When metaphysics appeals to geometry, and following its example, lays down strict definitions, etc., it turns the exception into the rule, and naturally falls into error. Its doctrine of method, i.e., the Aristotelian Organon, is like metaphysics in this. A new Organon, such as Bacon indeed demanded, is therefore still a necessity at the present time.
10. Gruppe gives hints towards such a reformation of logic in the second of the works mentioned, and repeats them in his third work. Logic, he says, ought to be a theory of cognition, and it therefore asks first of all; How does an act of cognition in general originate? and receives for answer: By means of that synthesis which we all call judgment. (Notions first arise out of judgments, and not *vice versa.*) A judgment, however, is not, as most seem to believe, an equation, like mathematical propositions; for in that case it might be reversed. But if, in order to learn what its nature is, we place ourselves at the point of view of the physicist in what he does, we find that every judgment is a comparison of one object with another, and that the latter thereby becomes a predicate. (Glass is electric, equals: Glass is like amber.) If in addition, we reflect on verbal expression, and attend to what comparative philology teaches us, which is confirmed by the observation of children (who ask, What is the name of uncle's John?), we arrive at the result, that in such a synthesis, both predicate and subject get another meaning, and that, for this reason, general terms, marks, in short, all notions, are seen to be nothing else than formulae, which, just because they are abstract, *i.e.*, have been got by abstraction, have only the appearance of being simple. It is only when we reverse the correct method that they can be taken as starting-points—what speculative philosophy has hitherto always done. It was confirmed in this course by the Aristotelian Organon, which, by the emphasis it lays on affirmation and negation, proves itself to be the offspring of Eleatic-Platonic dialectic, and in the use it makes of the syllogism shows that it had been led astray by putting too high a value upon mathematical methods. It moreover comes into contradiction with itself, inasmuch as at one time it contrasts induction with the syllogism, and at another time subordinates it to it. To what speculative philosophy has come, by adhering to its rules, is strikingly shown in the views held by philosophers on space and time, for in these views, from the chaos of Hesiod to the theories of Kant and Hegel, simple relations amongst things have been turned into the fundamental causes of the existence of things. The fact that the views maintained by speculative philosophy have reached the form of the Hegelian absurdities, according to which the notion is no longer the creation of our thought, but its creator, and the *contradictio in adjecto* is
a proof of truth, etc., is a decided gain. For owing to this, a
turning-point has been reached, and there is a prospect of
having a philosophy which will certainly not contain either a
system, or a metaphysics and a philosophy of religion, but
which, on the contrary, while taking as its starting-point the
given real world, will stand in a friendly relation to science—
taking that word in the sense in which it is understood by
the French and the English.

II. Gruppe's peculiar doctrines, like those of Beneke, re-
ceived little attention from the Hegelian school. It is true
that a criticism on the Turning-point by Rosenkranz appeared
in the Berliner Jahrbücher, but it does not enter very much
into the consideration of the positive positions taken up. In
philosophy, too, Gruppe experienced what he did not escape
in the sphere of philology, namely, that the simple fact of
activity in different departments raised the suspicion of dilett-
tantism. In both departments, however, many who called him
a dilettante were not thereby prevented from appropriating
a thought here and a thought there out of his books.

B.—PHENOMENA IN THE SPHERE OF THE PHILOSOPHY
OF RELIGION.

§ 335.

I. Weisse had declared himself to be in agreement with
the substance of the Hegelian logic, and with the method
which it recommended; Fichte, Fischer, and even Braniss
had shown that they quite approved of the method, and yet
they partly demanded and partly gave a wholly different
philosophy of nature and of spirit. Günther and Pabst, again,
with a totally different logic and method, reached a philosophy
of nature the agreement of which with the Hegelian they
admitted. All this,—but especially the fact that Göschel and
Schaller came forward as defenders of the Hegelian school
and did not employ the dialectic method,—necessarily made
the proud proclamation of the unshakable foundation of
philosophy, and of the method which harmonizes with the
movement of the object, appear doubtful, to say the least.
Just as this makes it clear that the interest in metaphysics,—
that is, in the first point in which Hegel had shown himself
to be a restorer,—was on the wane; the fact, again, that the
Hegelians began to occupy themselves exclusively with that
wherein the master had wrought a second reform, helps to explain why the question of a logical foundation and of dialectical development was so soon regarded with perfect indifference.

2. This second work of restoration consisted in the fact that, as Hegel often expressed himself, his system was orthodox. Still more frequently there occurs in his writings the formula—a formula untenable according to his own Logic—that his philosophy has the same content as (the Christian) religion, and differs from it only in respect of form. What he meant by both formulas was, that his system made it once more possible to prove that there was a rational meaning, not so much in Bible doctrine—for even Kant and Fichte had reproduced the Johannine prologue—as in ecclesiastical dogmas and in the creeds. Hence his incessant gibes at three theological tendencies—at rationalism, which places religion in morality only; at supernaturalism, which sees in the dogmas only what has been handed down, and not what is deducible; at the theology of feeling, which puts subjective piety in the place of the Confession of the Church. So long as the School thought that the way in which Hegel reproduced the dogmas philosophically was the only correct one, it could feel no need of having a thorough revision of its position; and accordingly it confined its activity at this time to the task of proving that the standpoints upon which the master had poured out his mockery deserved it. Marheineke’s preface to the second edition of his Dogmatics, which even those who do not side with him have pronounced to be a splendid epitaph placed over the graves of departed rationalism and supernaturalism, proves to both parties that their views are one-sided. Isaac Rust, in his frequently reprinted work, Philosophy and Christianity (Mannheim, 1825), points out to the rationalists; Göschel in his Aphorisms before-mentioned (§ 329, 10) points out to the literalist supernaturalists; Kasimir Conradi (lived and died a clergyman in Dérxheim), in his Self-consciousness and Revelation (Mainz, 1835), points out to the theologians of feeling, that if they rightly understood their own views they would find themselves compelled to adopt a speculative theology in the Hegelian sense. The criticisms in the Berliner Jahrbücher, by Lehnerdt, on Rust’s book, and by Hegel himself on Göschel’s, and the delight with which the younger men among the Hegelians greeted Conradi’s book,
proved what a deep interest was felt at the time in the question of the relation between faith and knowledge—a circumstance to which such an immature production as my *Lectures on Faith and Knowledge* (Berlin, 1837) owed the very friendly reception it met with among the professors, and what was at any rate the fairly good reception it got from the reading public.

3. It was necessary, however, that sooner or later, particularly after the death of the master, attention should be transferred from this preliminary question to the why and wherefore of the so frequently lauded reconciliation of faith and knowledge. Hegel himself, when he spoke of the orthodox character of his philosophy, that is, of its character as justifying dogma, had very often explained it by saying that it united the thought of substantiality with that of subjectivity, as was fitting, or to put it more shortly, that it made substance subjective. A great deal may justly be said against the reduction of such concrete relations as those with which we are here concerned to abstract logical categories, which do nothing more than constitute the basis of these relations. It was not only, that when Hegel first used that formula every one reflected that Spinozism and the System of Identity had ended in Pantheism because they had conceived of the absolute as substance, and that, on the contrary, the eighteenth century and Fichte had quite lost sight of God because He had become for them something purely subjective (an aspiration of the heart or a moral requirement); but it was seen that all the questions, the answers to which, given by the Fathers of the Church, supplied the Church with its dogmas, may really be reduced to those abstract formulas, and therefore, too, all the problems which a speculative theology has to solve. The logical question, whether and how substance can be subjective, undoubtedly lies at the basis of the question which, because it concerns the being of God, may be called the theological question. This is the question which, during the period of the construction of dogmas, was known as the Trinitarian (§§ 139, 140), and which, in modern theology, has taken the form of the question regarding the personality of God. The further question, namely, the anthropological one, with which the active movement in the construction of dogmas reached its close, asks for information as to whether man is something independent, something self-asserting,—and this may be conceived of either as self-assertion against compulsion, and there-
fore as freedom (§ 144), or as self-assertion against destruction, and therefore as immortality,—and may be easily formulated thus: Does substantiality belong to the subject, or is it a pure accident? Finally, the soteriological or christological question, which was taken up and answered in the period of the construction of dogmas between these two (§ 142), may be reduced to the question: How does (the Divine) substance appear in the (human) subject? Here, also, the christological question appears between the two others, only the anthropological question now emerges first, and the theological question, although it moves side by side with the others, is, along with consciousness, made the hinge upon which the others turn, but only quite at the end.

4. That within the School itself the necessity should have arisen of undertaking a revision of opinion on these points, was a consequence of the indefiniteness in which Hegel, in his Logic, had left the very categories with which we are here concerned. In passing from the Second Part of the Logic to the Third—from essence to notion, from necessity to freedom,—he had shown that the contrast between substantiality and what is of the nature of accident so equalizes itself that the former enters into the Notion as universality, and the latter as particularity, and that the Notion in this way comes to be concrete subjectivity. Instead of this expression, he commonly uses the word individuality, in deference to the ruling usage of the School-logic; and, although he warns us against confounding the unmediated individual with the true individual, since, in the common usage of language, we never understand by the individual anything but just that unmediated individuality, there was a possibility, nay, a likelihood, that when Hegel spoke of the individual, or even of the subject, this would be taken to mean an individual copy which could be duplicated. This copy, just because its substantiality lies outside of itself, is accidental and transitory, instead of a real subject, which is individual and not capable of being repeated, because it is its own substant, and subsists through itself. Whoever, in contrast to this, emphasized the fact that, according to Hegel, the individual no longer has its substance opposed to itself (outside itself), and now maintained with regard to the individual that it was more than a copy, that it could not be replaced, etc., was perhaps in closer agreement with the master than those others. Since the latter, however,
spoke like the rest of the world, it will be easily understood why everybody credited them with understanding Hegel better.

§ 336.

1. The *immortality* of man, which the System of Identity had joined Spinoza in ridiculing, and in place of which both had put the present possession of true ideas, was for the eighteenth century, and therefore, too, for Fichte at the beginning, the dogma *par excellence*. Hegel himself had seldom expressed his views on this point. He did this most definitely in his criticism of the work of Schubart, who charged him with denying immortality. In this criticism, he says that in his philosophy "spirit is lifted beyond all those categories which include the ideas of dissolution, destruction, dying, etc., not to speak of other quite as express determinations." Other expressions, such as, that immortality is "quality in a definite form of being," might, like Fichte's, "No man can be saved by being buried," be understood to mean, that death does not interrupt salvation, or to mean, that after death there is no salvation. In the School this point was treated as an ἀφροτήτων, and continued to be so even after one of the School had given expression to his views upon it. Ludwig Andreas Feuerbach (born July 28th, 1804, at Anspach; studied in Heidelberg and Berlin; was for a time *Docent* in Erlangen; lived after this for a long time on his own property in Bruckberg as a prolific author, and died on the 12th of September, 1872. His collected works were published in Leipsic by Otto Wigand), issued anonymously his *Thoughts on Death and Immortality* (Nürnberg, 1831), in which, instead of turning death into a mere sham-death as the doctrine of immortality did, he sought to restore it once more to a place of honour, and to prove that it was the necessary dissolution of the finite in the infinite, and that the continued existence of man consists in historical remembrance. Feuerbach, accordingly, describes his theory as pure undisguised pantheism. It was not only on account of the invectives against Marheineke and some allusions which might be taken as referring to Hegel that the book made no impression on the rest of the Hegelians, but in particular because its arguments rested wholly on the contrast of infinite and finite, essence and appearance, etc., beyond which, according to Hegel, only the abstract
understanding does not get. The question acquired greater prominence in the School through the works of Blasche, a follower of Schelling (vid. § 319, 2), inasmuch as Michelet and Marheineke brought them into notice. Since, however, they did this in the way of pure opposition, the matter still rested as it was. The School was more directly brought to take up a decisive attitude on this question through the appearance of the following works of Friedrich Richter of Magdeburg: The Doctrine of the Last Things (first vol., Breslau, 1833; second, 1844), and The New Doctrine of Immortality (Breslau, 1833). (The later writings of the author: On the Notion of God and Majesty, the discourses on Continued Personal Existence, and On the Messianic Idea, attracted no such attention.) In these works, Richter seeks to prove that, according to Hegel’s principles, an enduring personal existence is out of the question,—what, for the rest, could be desired only by the egoist, who is incapable of an act of resignation. Weisse, who criticized this work in the Berliner Jahrbücher (September, 1833), justly remarked that there was no resignation whatever in desiring annihilation where there was inner emptiness; that the principles of modern philosophy supply us with data for deducing the immortality of the regenerate; and that, besides, it showed a certain crudeness to discuss such questions in popular books which were read by those who were incapable of speculation. Owing to this last statement, Weisse was charged by Richter (in The Secret Doctrine of Modern Philosophy, Breslau, 1833), and also by others in different quarters, with concealing his own want of belief in existence after death. Weisse, accordingly, wrote likewise a Philosophical Esoteric-Doctrine (Dresden, 1834), in which he attempted to show that Hegel was compelled to arrive at a denial of personal immortality, although he had never stated his denial from a praiseworthy regard for the consciences of others. The results of modern philosophy may, however, be employed in quite a different and much better way, if the Absolute is assumed to be personal. We may thus save immortality; of the truth of which we are certain, not indeed a priori, but by means of our religious and moral experience, and in which, moreover, only the regenerate will share.

2. While Weisse was occupied with this work, there appeared a criticism by Göschel (Berl. Jahrb., January, 1834) of the works of Richter mentioned above, which, not unreason-
ably, had been anxiously awaited by the School; for it is from its appearance that the split in the School dates which, ever since Strauss uttered his witty conceit, has been known as the contrast of the Right and Left sides. In virtue of the superiority which Spirit has over Nature, according to Göschel it passes beyond the insurmountable opposition of the universal (of species), and the particular (of the individual copy) which exists in nature, and is particularity, individuum, personality. Pantheism is unable to conceive of these ideas, and it is to pantheism that not only Richter but many others as well reduce Hegelianism. Göschel, just as Feuerbach and Richter, followed Hegel in employing the expression individual for what would have been better called subject. This led in his case to attributing eternal existence to something which, because man therein shows himself to be what is capable of reproduction, to be a copy, in fact, is perishable and fleeting. Those, accordingly, were right enough who said that he made man immortal even to skin and hair, while according to Feuerbach and Richter, not so much as a human hair would continue to exist. This question was more fully developed by Göschel in his work, On the Proofs for Immortality, etc. (Berlin, 1835), wherein he distinguishes three principal proofs, which are put on a parallel with the three proofs for the existence of God, and which are represented as corresponding to the three stages of individuum, subject, and spirit. The fact that many attacked only the outworks of this book, an edifying Easter-study which formed the preface, and the supplement, in which among Hegel’s sayings one was quoted which the editors of Hegel’s Works had erroneously incorporated in the same, did not say much for the thorough study of a work which was at any rate a remarkable one. Göschel seemed especially pleased with that very Preface, for the Seven-fold Easter Question (Berlin, 1837) appeared in the form of a commentary upon it. Opponents of the Hegelian school paid almost more attention to Göschel’s theories than the members of the School; but while professing that they agreed with Göschel’s main positions, they denied that these represented the Hegelian doctrine. This was the position taken up by Weisse, and by Fichte both in his criticism of Richter’s book (Blatt für Lit. Unterh., 1833) and in his own work, The Idea of Personality (1834; 2nd revised edition, 1855), and also by a follower of the Neo-Schellingian doctrine,
Hubert Beckers, in *On C. F. Göschel's Attempt*, etc. (Hamburg, 1836). Hinrichs combated these positions (*Berliner Jahrb.,* April, 1836), and asserted the Hegelian character of Göschel's works, although he found fault with them for their lack of strict method.

3. How very strongly, quite apart from the position of the Hegelian school, the question of immortality stirred men's minds at that time, is evident from the charming little work which, under the name of "Mises"—a name celebrated in humorous literature—Fechner (*vid. infra sub § 347, 10*), published as *The Booklet of the Life after Death* (Dresden, 1836). In this we have the first germs of the thought which was later so ably developed, concerning the psychical nature of what had been considered to be without a soul, and the penetration of the lower organism by the higher. Partly by way of refuting these ideas, and partly by way of supplementing them, Weisse wrote, this time under the pseudonym of Nicodemus, *The Booklet of the Resurrection* (Dresden, 1836). According to this book, as an embryonic life in the form simply of body precedes the earthly life, so the heavenly life ought to be preceded by a Hades-life in the form simply of soul. Man, who is by nature mortal, becomes immortal by partaking of spirit. Thus those who are wholly devoid of spirit pass away, those who willingly accept spirit are saved, and those who accept it unwillingly are damned. If Weisse here seeks an intermediate standpoint between the views of Fichte, Blasche, and Richter, who deny to man any kind of existence after death, and those of Göschel, who, as it seemed to many, allowed him to take everything with him at death, a similar attempt to reach an intermediate view was made simultaneously in the Hegelian school. K. Conradi's *Immortality and Eternal Life* (Mainz, 1837) has, besides its many other merits, this one, that it separates the two conceptions specified in the title from one another, so that any one who with Weisse denies to man eternal life, does not therefore deny to him immortality also. This work, perhaps the most important on the subject, was taken very little notice of by the Hegelians. The reason of this undoubtedly was, that Conradi, whose first work above mentioned had been correctly described as a phenomenology of the religious consciousness, in this work also so entirely identifies the phenomenological moment with the real, that is, the necessity of belief in immor-
tality with immortality itself, that it often looks as if he wished to justify the former without asserting the truth of the latter. There was a still stronger reason for his book being overlooked, this namely, that the interest felt by the Hegelian school in the philosophy of religion had been transferred from the anthropological question to the christological, in connection with which, much more than in connection with the other, the gulf which separated the two sides from each other was to become visible.

§ 337.

1. Christology became the essentially burning question in the Hegelian school owing to the appearance of The Life of Jesus Critically Treated by David Friedrich Strauss (Tübingen, 1835–36). The author (born in Ludwigsburg on the 27th January, 1808, died in his native town on the 8th February, 1874), when no longer a personal auditor of Hegel's but, as Repetent at Tübingen, the real representative of the Hegelian philosophy there, had already in two critiques in the Berliner Jahrbücher during the years 1832 and 1834, given expression to the two fundamental thoughts which at a later period formed the dogmatic and critical basis of his famous book. In the first of these critiques, that on Rosenkranz's Encyclopedia, the view is advanced that, since the philosopher treats of the world before taking up the absolute spirit, he ought to see in it nothing more than the Idea manifesting itself in an external form, i.e., Nature; and that thus the conception of creation does not exist for him. But if miracle is an interruption of the course of nature by means of creative activity, we can only call it a consequence of what has just been said when we find that this Critique takes up a most decided attitude of opposition to miracle. The second critique, that on Sieffert, Schneckenburger, and Merz, exults over the contradictions in the Biblical narratives, and still more over the artifice of reason which leads one exegete to sacrifice the Synoptics to John and another to sacrifice John to the Synoptics, and thereby advances the education of humanity from the stage of the letter to that of the spirit. The work just mentioned develops the consequences which follow from these thoughts. It criticizes with equal severity the standpoint of the supernaturalistic and rationalistic Bible exegetes,
who are agreed in holding that the Bible, especially the New Testament, contains history, while the greater part of it consists of myths, the authors of which, inspired with the spirit of the Christian community, invented by a process of unconscious symbolizing what was felt by the spirit of the Church to be ideal truth. In this way the historical fact that the greatest of all religious genuises, Jesus, was brought, particularly by the influence of John the Baptist, first to expect the Messiah and then to feel himself to be the Messiah, supplied the point of attachment for these myths, while the garb in which they were clothed was supplied by the prevailing Messianic ideas. It is impossible that these narratives can have any reality in them, because they relate what is physically and psychologically impossible (miraculous). Still, they contain truth, because the Infinite does really flow over into finitude, though certainly not into one single example; and not indeed one man, but Humanity, truly united with God, lives on in spite of death. Schleiermacher with his distinction between the ideal and the historical Christ, Kant with his explanation of dogmas, verged on the truth. The former was untrue to himself, since he admitted the impossibility of the two Christs being found together, and yet maintained that this impossibility was the only real miracle. The latter, again, fell into the error of conceiving of the union of God and man as simply something which ought to be. In short, a dogmatic which in the locus of Christ stops short at the individual, instead of going beyond this to the idea of the human species, is no dogmatic but only a sermon. (It did not show gratitude on the part of Strauss, that in his closing dissertation he made no mention of Schelling’s historical construction of Christianity. At a later time, he called it the only bit of free thought which Schelling ever wrote.)

2. The reception which this book met with from the side of the theologians does not belong to the present discussion, although it had a decisive influence on Strauss’ fortunes, since it was owing to it that he first lost his place as Repetent in Tübingen, and then a professorship in Zürich, and that afterwards he lectured on his own account in Stuttgart, Heilbronn, Weimar, Cologne, Heidelberg, Bonn and Darmstadt. In the philosophical world, Hegel’s opponents in particular were delighted at all this, as for instance Eschenmayer (vid. § 313, 3). Within the Hegelian school an ever-increasing divergence
of opinion manifested itself. F. Chr. Baur, Strauss's teacher, asserted in his work, *The Christian Gnosis* (Tübingen, 1835), which appeared simultaneously with the *Life of Jesus*, that Hegel maintained the existence only of a divine humanity, and not that of an individual God-man. **Wilhelm Vatke**, again (born 1806; at that time a Privatdocent, and at present a professor in Berlin [died in Berlin, April 19, 1882.—Ed.]), a personal friend of Strauss, gave expression to his views in *Biblical Theology*. In the first and only volume, which takes up the religion of the Old Testament (Berlin, 1835), Vatke asserts, in opposition to Baur, that the sensuous manifestation of the God-Man, which in any case is not what is highest, is conceived of as mythical. **Bruno Bauer**, who was at that time a colleague of Vatke's (born Sept. 9th, 1809; from 1834 to 1839 a Privatdocent of theology in Berlin; from 1839 onwards in Bonn, where in 1842 he was deprived of his office as Docent, and afterwards lived privately in Berlin [died on April 13th, 1882, at Rixdorf near Berlin.—Ed.]), in a review of Strauss's book (*Berliner Jahrbücher*, December, 1835), took up a most decided attitude of opposition to Strauss. In the year 1836 he also started the *Zeitschrift für speculative Theologie* (3 vols. with four parts in each, Berlin 1836–38), which became the organ of those Hegelians who were averse to the direction Strauss's views were taking, and in which many of the works that later appeared first came out, though only in a fragmentary manner. **Gabler**, who also was on the list of the contributors, declared himself in his Latin inaugural address (1836) as strongly opposed to the views of Strauss. A collective review (I., 1) which I wrote of the works mentioned in the previous Section, contains some of the thoughts which at a later time were more fully developed in a paper specially intended for the Journal, *Body and Soul* (Halle, 1837, 2nd ed., 1849). Göschel contributed (II., 2) an Essay entitled, *First and Last*, a confession of faith of speculative philosophy, which contains as its main thoughts what was more fully developed in his *Contributions to Speculative Theology* (Berlin, 1838). In this work he attempts to show that, as a kingdom becomes a unity through the monarch, humanity becomes a unity through primitive man, who lives as a moment in God and at the same time as soul in created humanity. In a paper (III., 1), *On Contradictions in Christian Doctrines*, I sought to show that the philosophical treatment of the question to which we are driven by the con-
tradictions in religious ideas results in a mythical (i.e. a mis-) interpretation, only in circumstances such as find no place in the Christian religion. Schaller contributed (III., 2) an essay, On the Characteristics of the Mythical Explanation of the Evangelical History, out of which at a later time grew the work entitled The Historical Christ and Philosophy (Leipsic, 1838). In this book he finds fault specially with the application of the generic notion to spirit, and seeks to prove that the historical Christ, in whom the thought of divine humanity came to light, can alone be the real God-man. In the same way Conradi's essay, On the Pre-existence of Christ (III., 2), later became the work, Christ in the Present, Past, and Future (1839), in which it was granted to Strauss that it was the Christian community that was the one which had risen from the dead, and was a worker of miracles, etc.; but it was concluded from this, that also its founder must be thought of in this light. Here, even more than in the work on immortality, the phenomenological and metaphysical ways of regarding the subject were confounded, so that some gathered from the book that Conradi, like Strauss, taught nothing more than that the Christian community saw the God-man in Christ, while others emphasized the fact that he said Christ must have been so conceived of, and that what must be thought of, certainly is. No such double meaning could be put upon the essays of Bauer, the Editor. Although the laudatory notice of Tholuck's work, written in opposition to Strauss, enters upon the New Testament question, these essays have reference mostly to the Old Testament, and were preliminary studies for The Critique of the History of Revelation: Part First (in two volumes), The Religion of the Old Testament (Berlin, 1838). Bauer here comes forward in opposition to the negative results reached in particular by Vatke, and supposes the existence of prehistoric and mythical elements only to the time of Abraham, and even in the case of these insists that we may gather real history from them, particularly as to the condition of the period in which they arose. The patriarchal standpoint, that of the law, the contrast between law and self-consciousness, and finally prophecy, constitute the divisions of this work, in the introduction to which Bauer gives detailed expression to his views on the relation of Christianity to Judaism, Hellenism and Roman civilization, all three of which co-operated in the construction of dogmas.
3. Strauss himself gave expression to his views on his relation to the Hegelian school in the 3rd No. of his Controversial Writings (Tübingen, 1837). He acknowledges that Hegel’s distinction between notion and presentation brought him not only, like Marheineke and others, to purify the presentation somewhat, but really to get beyond the form of presentation. Hegel himself, who was a thoroughly anti-critical, anti-revolutionary philosopher of restoration, would hardly have admitted that he agreed with these conclusions, which were thus drawn from his statements. They did, however, follow from his principles; and therefore Strauss declares that he had not reverted to the views of Schleiermacher, as Rosenkranz had reproached him with doing. On the contrary, the anti-critical Hegelians were guilty of having gone back to the views of Schelling. As to the school of Hegel, that, like the French parliament, was breaking up into two sides. On the Left he himself sits, if he is allowed, that is to say—while Göschel, Gabler, Bruno Bauer, occupy the Right, and Rosenkranz takes the Centre. This witty comparison met with so much approval that it has maintained itself down to the present time. Michelet (vid. § 329, 10), carried the conceit still further. In his History of the last Systems of Philosophy in Germany (2 vols., Berlin, 1837–38), he reminds himself that the earlier pupils of Hegel likewise belong to the Left, then proposes that the Centre should enter into a coalition with the Left, so that it may no longer be neither fish nor flesh; and by wholly disregarding the points of Strauss’ comparison promises to this coalition the leadership which had belonged to the departed master, and along with it an imposing majority. That there might be no doubt of his belonging to the Upper House of the Hegelian parliament, he appeared with proxies, and substitutes for Gans, Vatke and Benary. Rosenkranz, who protested strongly against the validity of the principle of majorities, treated Strauss’s conceit from a humorous point of view in a comedy, The Centre of Speculation (Königsberg, 1840), in which, in a tone of almost frivolous self-mockery, he said things which gave an inveterate opponent occasion to declare that this self-knowledge disarmed criticism. If we keep to Strauss’ description, it will be understood why Schaller, who granted to Strauss a great deal to which Göschel and Bruno Bauer were opposed, was placed beside Rosenkranz, i.e. in the Centre. Vatke, who criticized Schaller’s Historical Christ
in a thorough-going way in the *Hallische Jahrbücher* (1838, p. 2271), said nevertheless that the latter had reached the extreme limits of concession in reference to presentation, and had thus manifestly placed himself nearer Strauss. It is interesting to note in this criticism, how Vatke asserts that the indignation occasioned by the idea that the infinite spirit first reaches consciousness in the finite, rests partly on the misunderstanding by which the finite spirit was understood to mean only the human spirit. God is personal even before the human spirit comes to know Him, but not apart from the finite spirit, and Vatke holds that in the conception of the angels of the Bible, which have sprung from the star-spirits, there is more truth than many imagine. Although, as was said at the time, this thought was originally due to Strauss, Vatke was likewise regarded as holding an intermediate position. There could be no doubt on this point so far as Conradi was concerned, for in his work he declared himself to be as much opposed to Strauss as to Göschel. Superficial readers imagined they observed, even in the case of Strauss himself, a return to a middle position when his essay, *On the Permanent and the Perishable in Christianity*, appeared in the third part of the *Freihaven*, and especially later, when one of the *Two Peaceful Papers* came out, in which, starting from the fact that we do not erect any cathedrals, but do erect statues and monuments without number, Strauss proclaimed the worship of genius as the religion of the cultured, and in the Pantheon of this religious community along side of Raphael and Mozart gave a place also to the religious genius of Jesus.

4. In the conflict between the two sides of the Hegelian school, their opponents took part in such a way that, so far as regards the substance of the theories, they agreed with the Right, but on the other hand allowed that the Left represented the peculiarly Hegelian theory. The organ for these utterances was Fichte's *Zeitschrift*, previously referred to. The contributors whose names stood on the title-page, agreed in scarcely anything else. In it appeared Weisse's criticism of Tholuck's book (I., 1), which identified the standpoint of Strauss entirely with that of Hegel, and also Nitzsch's notice of Gabler's inauguration programme (II., 1), which did not go so far, but advised the Hegelian philosophy to abandon the claim of having made no assumptions. Here, too, appeared Krabbe's article on the *Relation between Philosophical ana*
Christian Ethics, in which he places Leibnitz above Hegel, because, according to the latter, God first attains to consciousness in man; Fichte's treatise on New Systems and the Old School (II., 2), which describes Strauss and Michelet as genuine Hegelians, and points out that the Right Wing went beyond the master; Vorländer's essay on Strauss (III., 1) according to which Strauss had made the conflict between Hegel and Christianity apparent, and had shown that salvation was to be found only in returning to Schleiermacher; and, finally, what Weisse (III., 2), pretty much on the same lines as the utterances of Fichte just referred to, wrote on the Personality of God, a paper which was occasioned by the work of Frauenstädt and the accompanying preface by Gabler.

5. The position that Weisse himself took up with regard to the christological question appears from his Evangelical History (2 vols., Leipsic, 1835), with which Fichte declared he was in essential agreement. He explains that his aim in this book is to restore the historical figure of Christ by getting rid of the covering of indistinctness with which it had been surrounded in early times by tradition, and later, by the dogmas of the Church. At one with Strauss in denying all that is miraculous, he admits the possibility of cures, and of a power of perceiving what was future and distant on the part of Christ, and even of appearances of Christ after death; because what in the case of others is a sign of disease, such as somnambulism and walking about after death, was in his case a manifestation of the most perfect health. Agreed, further, with Strauss, in holding that a mythical element is mixed up with the evangelical history, he contends that in this we are to see historical myths, i.e., myths which contain the philosophy of history in a symbolical form. Thus, for instance, in the tracing of Christ's genealogy to David, the historical connection of Judaism and Christianity is recognized; in the narrative of the Magi, the idea is expressed that the religion of nature also points to Christianity; while from the fact that the relation of Christ to Moses and Elias was perfectly evident to the Disciples, there arose, according to him, the myth of the visible transfiguration, and so on. In opposition to the pantheistic assertion, that God first becomes a person in man, and to the mystic assertion that He first becomes a person in Christ, Weisse lays down the position, that it was not God in
His individuality and entirety who attained to personality and self-consciousness in Christ, but the God who is within the world, as distinguished from the personal Father, the Logos in fact, who also in pre-Christian times lived in man, but first came to personal consciousness in Christ, so that since Christ's time, most men become partakers of salvation only by conscious repetition of the image of Christ; most men, he says, for the limitation of salvation to believers appears to Weisse to constitute the chief difference between the ecclesiastical and the cultured consciousness. As there was a way of salvation before Christ, so too, after him, there is a possibility of being saved without having heard of him. Throughout the entire work there runs a polemic directed against the notion that in the work of redemption the regular course of history was interrupted, and that God had appeared as a Deus ex machina, although Weisse admits that by the entrance of sin the conflicts of the history of the world have taken the place of the fixed laws of nature. (The question as to whether the acceptance of the idea of something unnatural, of evil in fact, the existence of which is denied by Pantheism, has not for its necessary correlate the supposition of something above nature, i.e. of miracle, does not seem to have presented itself to Weisse).

§ 338.

1. Since all religious differences ultimately rest on the different ways of conceiving the idea of God, in discussions on the anthropological and christological questions, the theological question must, incidentally at least, be touched upon. It was forced into the foreground once more, owing to a book by Strauss; and along with it the two other questions were naturally also subjected to a new scrutiny. If in this case also, as in that of the two others, the contrast between the two sides of the School were to repeat itself,—seeing that this question includes all religious questions,—on the one side would stand those who maintain with the master that their philosophy is orthodox, because dogma is rational, while on the other side, the Left Wing, would stand those who assert the impossibility of uniting dogma with philosophy, faith with reason. Since, according to the Hegelian formula quoted above (§ 334, 3), this latter statement amounts to saying that the substantiability and subjectivity of the absolute are incom-
compatible—or to express it in a more concrete form—that they do not neutralize the pantheism of the System of Identity and the atheism of the Science of Knowledge—it can be understood why the Left Wing of the Hegelian school manifests two diametrically opposite tendencies, which have been superficially regarded as one, because they both attack religion, and still more, the defenders of religion amongst the Hegelians. Pantheism in the Hegelian Left is represented primarily by Strauss, while Feuerbach and Bruno Bauer represent the diametrical opposite of pantheism.

2. Strauss, in his second famous book, *The Christian Doctrine of Faith in its Development and in its Conflict with Modern Science* (2 vols., Tübingen, 1841–42), first of all defines his relation to Hegel quite differently from the way in which he had hitherto done. According to him, there could be no doubt that his conception of the Hegelian theory was the only correct one. (Properly speaking, as in the case where a Whig ministry follows a Tory, what had hitherto been called the Opposition ought from this time forward to have been called the Right.) The other side, above all, Göschel and Bruno Bauer, were covered with scorn. Schleiermacher received almost similar treatment, perhaps because Strauss was compelled to hear, oftener than he liked, that he had gone back to Schleiermacher's views. The Christian religion and modern philosophy were opposed to each other as theism and pantheism, because Spinoza was in a special sense the father of the latter. Any attempt to blend the two only results in such ridiculous productions as the works of Weisse. Dogma is the product of the uncultured consciousness; and when a philosopher calls himself a Christian, he may have his reasons for so doing, but reason certainly not. The consciousness which does not understand itself places the infinite content which it feels within itself as a vague impulse, outside of itself, because it knows itself at the same time as sensuous and empirical, so that it has what is one and the same thing twice over, in the form of something beyond the world, and of something present in the world. The philosopher who recognises that both are one, has on this account no worse enemy than what is beyond the world, which he has to conceive of and to represent as something which is present here and now. Since history has already accomplished this process of destruction, the criticism of dogmas coincides with the account of their
history. Strauss for this reason takes up each dogmatic *locus*, discusses the first traces of its origin in the Bible, shows how ecclesiastical dogma has grown out of biblical doctrine, how with the Reformation the process of breaking up begins, how the incomplete views of the Reformers were improved upon by the Socinians and Arminians, by Spinoza and the English Deists, how these last again were further improved upon by the French and German Enlightenment, until, in the joint Pantheism of Hegel and Schelling, the result is reached, that the one Infinite which manifests its energy in the finite, takes the place of God and the world. He further shows, that there is no other God than the thought which is in all thinking beings, that there are no attributes of God which are other than the laws of nature, that in the All there is no sign of increase or diminution, that the Absolute reflects itself from all eternity in ever different finite spirits, like a large orangefruit in which we always see buds, blossoms, and fruit, though these are never the same. Whoever has accomplished something may die calmly. The positions of the first work are maintained in this book to be incapable of refutation. If attention was called above to the agreement between these and the theories of Schelling, it must here be regarded as characteristic that Blasche in particular is referred to, and that, although in reference to Spinoza, it is said that there is wanting in his Substance the negativity which necessitates the positing of the individual, and which meets its due in Hegel, still fault is found with Hegel for the very thing by which he surmounted crude Pantheism, namely, his disregard of endless progress, and of the dilemma. It is not only in regard to this last point that the views of Michelet in his work, *On the Personality of God and Human Immortality* (Berlin, 1841), are closely connected with those of Strauss. When he declared that *also* is the most unphilosophical of words, perhaps he was thinking of what Hegel had said, that it was the *aut aut*. Michelet differs from Strauss, in that the latter, in order to escape having to lay down a beginning for the conscious existence of the Absolute, refers, like Vatke, to spirits in other stars, in which it knows itself eternally, an idea which Michelet pronounces to be transcendental superstition. Conversely, Strauss recognises in what is revealed to us by the strata of the earth, monuments of an earlier past, while Michelet, on the contrary, despatches the whole history
of the earth with the remark, that it transforms the co-exis-
tent into what is successive, forgets that Nature presents us
only with what is "splendid as on creation's day," and
which was therefore perfect from all eternity. Michelet does
not wish, as Strauss does, that this theory should be called
Pantheism; and he maintains that it satisfies the needs of
the religious consciousness. In a later work, *The Epiphany
of the Eternal Personality of the Spirit* (Nürnberg, 1844), he
says, that since God comes to consciousness and exists, not only
in one man, but in humanity, every one can say that God is
(for him) a transcendent existence, that he may pray to Him,
etc. (Exactly in the same way Berkeley held that things
existed only in minds, and yet were external to us. *Vid.*
§ 291, 6.) Baur, agreeing more or less with Strauss and
Michelet, taught in his *Christian Doctrine of the Trinity and
Incarnation of God* (3 vols., Tübingen, 1841–43), that Trinity
and creation were the same, that the Son was only the world
conceived of in abstracto. Fr. Theodor Vischer, celebrated
later as a writer on aesthetics, expressed himself still more
decidedly, partly in his characterization of Strauss in the
*Hallische Jahrbücher*, partly in other essays, to the effect that
true philosophy was incompatible with religion. Georgii op-
posed the two to each other as pantheism and dualism; and
that Märklin, at all events latterly, thought of them in the
same way, is evident from the biography by which Strauss
did honour, both to his friend and to himself. The Critical
school, usually called the Tübingen school, received a power-
ful impulse from Strauss, but only through his *Life of Jesus.*
Thus we find, as the positive complement of his negative
assertion, that these narratives were not historical, the view
that we can nevertheless gather real history from them, a
view partly suggested by the history of mythology,—since
Ottfried Müller had taught that in the histories of the gods
the history of the forms of worship which displaced one an-
other, could be recognised,—and partly borrowed from a man
in regard to whom this school is accustomed to be very re-
erved, namely Bruno Bauer.

3. We might recognise a chemical law in the fact that, as in
the Hegelian theory it was only the moment of Pantheism,
contained in it in a latent state, which had been liberated, now it
is the other opposite moment which is set free in the same
way; so that, in contrast to the former one-sidedness, Hegel's
theory is now changed into a pure theory of egoism. Amongst those who effected this was Feuerbach, who had still held fast by the pantheistic standpoint from which he combated immortality in the first volume of his *History of Modern Philosophy* (First Volume, from Bacon of Verulam to Benedict Spinoza, Ansbach, 1834). This is especially evident in his panegyrical account of Spinozism. We may therefore doubt whether he was in real earnest when he gave expression to the orthodox views which appeared two years later in a criticism he wrote in reference to the personality of God. When the continuation of the history appeared as, *The Description and History of the Philosophy of Leibnitz* (Ansbach, 1837), not only does the fact that he no longer holds that modern philosophy begins with Bacon show a change of standpoint, but his entire theory of the universe is different from what it was. As in the former instance he was enthusiastic about Spinoza, he is here enthusiastic about views which present a diametrical contrast to those of Spinoza, about a system of which he himself says, It has no place for a divinity. This at all events helped to bring him to give great prominence in this book to the contrast between philosophy, in which man and therefore theory hold the place of authority, and religion, in which the individual person and therefore practical necessities take the lead. He gives to philosophy in its relation to religion the task of explaining the origin of religion, but declares that every one who tries to prove that there is anything rational in the elements which compose it, is only a half or a three-fourths philosopher. He expressed himself still more decidedly in his *Pierre Bayle* (Ansbach, 1838). Here, too, the greatest stress is laid on the fact that, in religion personality is placed in the foreground, and thus even the highest thing that exists, namely the Good, is changed from being a *neutrum*, which it is, and reduced to something personal. The first step, therefore, to scientific knowledge, is an atheism like that of Fichte's, and nothing which is contained in Christianity can be compared to the lofty ideas contributed by this atheism. Even the heathen, as for instance Seneca, to whom the Good was not merely a predicate, had profounder thoughts than those supplied by Christianity, which but for reminiscences of the ideas of the pagan philosophers, would very soon have become an idolatry. *Dogma* is an express prohibition against thinking; and hence
it is, that everything in which there is an absence of thought, such as the miraculous, is of such importance to dogma. For this reason even sensuous pleasure, into which the spirit which has freed itself from dogma plunges, is more rational than faith. The task of philosophy is therefore not the justification of dogma, but the explanation of the illusion in which it originates. The essay, *On (i.e., against) Speculative Philosophy*, which appeared in the *Hallische Jahrbücher*, and which was occasioned by the writings of Sengler, Günther, and Baader, and the essay entitled *Philosophy and Christianity* (Leipsic, 1839), which was likewise intended for the same Journal, but which, owing to difficulties in connection with the censorship of the press, appeared as a separate work, develop the idea that speculative philosophy in general, but particularly when it appears as speculative theology, is a drunken philosophy and needs to become sober. It simply aims at self-mystification,—of which faith consists, which at bottom only reveres itself,—but does this in such a way that it misunderstands itself, and instead of perceiving that for it self-consciousness is the Absolute, begins to say: the Absolute is self-consciousness, instead of explaining and justifying its origin. It fails to perceive the diametrical opposition that exists between philosophy and religion, which stand related as thought and fantasy, as the healthy and unhealthy states of mind. The Hegelian Philosophy of Religion is not open to the objection of putting the human species in the place of the Godhead, but it is indeed to the opposite objection, that it does not sufficiently regard the notion of the human species as the only absolute, an idea which has been gained for thought especially since the time of Kant. In the year 1841, finally, appeared Feuerbach’s most celebrated work, the frequently republished *Essence of Christianity* (Leipsic, 1841), in which he seeks to show that religion consists in the fact that man makes his essence, his generic nature, objective, though certainly without knowing what now confronts him. Thus all theology is anthropology, a truth which Schleiermacher, just because he was certainly an atheist, came far more near recognising than Hegel, who reversed the important proposition that man knows only himself in his God, and said that God knows himself in man. If each religion sees in the one that has preceded it the deification of man, philosophy sees this also in the highest of all religions. It is owing to this uncon-
sciousness in reference to its own actions that religion in all its statements is seen to contain what are simply contre-vérités, which become truths so soon as subject and predicate are allowed to change places. From the statement, Compassion is divine, religion frames the proposition, God is compassionate. Since the statement, Love is divine, is turned into the proposition, God is love; and since love, apart from a sensuous nature and capacity for suffering, is unthinkable, there arise the dogmas of the Incarnation and of a suffering God. The Catholics are more logical than the Protestants, since they deify not only the love of the Father and the Son, but also the mother’s love. Because it appears to man to be something divine that all wishes should be fulfilled, by simply converting this thought the idea originates, that God fulfils our wishes, performs miracles, hears prayer, etc. That God in reality is only the affirmative answer to our own wishes, is most plainly seen in the dogma that we can be saved without works, that is, without trouble, and in the dogma that man is immortal. Up to this point it might seem as if Feuerbach were not teaching anything very different from what Fichte had taught in his first work (§ 310), with which Feuerbach’s book agrees often even to the very wording of the thoughts. The difference, however, is, that in Fichte that “divesting” which was held to be necessary for most, was looked on as harmless for all. Feuerbach takes quite a different view. Just because that of which man divests himself when he makes himself objective, is his essential nature, is the universally human element in him, religion makes humanity unhuman, limits it, abandons the universal and only increases egoism. It is in faith, therefore, that the evil principle essentially lies. Even when the Christian religion in a thoughtless fashion praises love, it makes of this a love which is confined to fellow-believers. Hence the horrors which have sprung from religion. The practical direction is, that we should convert all the statements of religion, and then we would get at the truth. What is true in the doctrine of the sacraments is, that eating and drinking and the bath are divine things.

4. It could hardly have been believed that Bruno Bauer, who had been treated, especially by Strauss, but by others as well, as the scapegoat of the Right Wing, would reach similar results. Just when Michelet had prophesied that he would very soon ally himself wholly with Hengstenberg, Bauer’s
Dr. Hengstenberg, a Contribution to the Criticism of the Religious Consciousness (Berlin, 1839), appeared. In this book a searching light was thrown upon the artifices of modern apologetics, particularly in connection with the Old Testament. In the following year there appeared anonymously The Evangelical National Church of Prussia and Science (Leipsic, 1840), with which is closely connected by way of a supplement, the essay, On the Christian State, which was printed two years later in the Hallische Jahrbücher. In these the union of the two evangelical confessions is celebrated,—seeing that a Church exists only by creed and sacrament,—as the destruction of the Church; whereupon, the attempt to acquire greater independence for the Church is described as an antiquated proceeding. There is no longer any Church. Religion at the present day is absorption in self-consciousness. The State, which was Christian when it was Byzantine and in the first period of the Reformation, when dogma conditioned the political situation, is now what the Church formerly was, the manifestation of the infinite self-consciousness. Religion exists only as religiosity, i.e., as thoughtless self-abandonment; and there is only one power to which to-day we ought to abandon ourselves, and that is the State. Accordingly, in the conflict between it and the Church, science takes its side; and when, to please the Church, it puts a check upon science, it is doing injury to its own flesh. The Critique of the Evangelical History of John (Bremen, 1840), which has nothing to do with philosophy, and insists that we ought not to regard what is the pragmatism of a later member of the Christian community, a pragmatism crammed with reflection, as the complement of the Synoptics, was followed by Bauer's most celebrated book, which, however, cost him his lectureship in Bonn—Critique of the Evangelical Narratives of the Synoptics (3 vols., Leipsic, 1841-42). The polemic against Strauss' Life of Jesus, which runs through the whole book, is directed in the first place against his critical presuppositions, in connection with which he reproaches Strauss with not having made use of the discovery by Weisse and Wilke of the priority of Mark to the other Synoptics. He next attacks his historical presuppositions, on the ground that there were no such highly-developed Messianic conceptions amongst the Jews; and, finally, he attacks his mythological presuppositions, on the ground that to find the origin of the myths in the unconscious
process of symbolizing prompted by the spirit of the Church, gives us nothing better than what was given by the old inspiration theory. The Biblical narratives are, on the contrary, to be regarded as the product of a conscious pragmatism, as fictions with a purpose. In spite of their sources, however, they give us historical information, since from such an artistic production we may gather what the condition of the period was in which it arose. To describe these poetical productions on this account as deception, because, taken as representing reality, they would be absurd and even horrible, would be as foolish as if we were to call Raphael's Christ-child a lie, in regard to which the same holds good. They contain truth, even what may be recognised as historical truth. Thus, in the history of the Temptation, the struggles and collisions which had agitated the Church, and in which its presence of mind achieved the victory because it turned back in fear from the abyss before which it stood, are represented as an incident in the life of Jesus into which they have been changed. The most important element in his writings, from a philosophical point of view, is to be found in Bauer's utterances with regard to the religious spirit. These under the form of "resting points" interrupt the critical discussions. The religious consciousness is opposed to the free consciousness as an alienated consciousness, and therefore to morality as well. In accordance with this, since what is theological is just what is not human, the perfection of religion is placed at a point at which nature, the family, the State, world-dominion, are no longer the essentially dominating powers revered as divine, and therefore not at a point at which the chains of the enslaved spirit appear any longer surrounded by the flowers of family and State interests, but where war has been declared against all these. So now, after the vampire of spiritual abstraction has sucked all the blood and life out of humanity, and has left behind the emaciated Ego as the solitary power, the spirit is not yet capable of doing without the illusion that its essential nature is an objective power (God) standing over against it. The position here referred to is the one occupied by the Christian religion. Its God, Christ, is born contrary to the course of nature, and works against it. He belongs to no family, to no nation, etc. As an historical existence, he would be a horrible being; as the peculiar essence of man in an objective form, set free from any connection with the sub-
stantial forces in human life, the essence of purely abstract selfhood, he is the culminating point of all religion. He is certainly its end as well; for when criticism, by proving the impossibility of such a subjective existence, denies any objective reality to what composes it, it has driven self-consciousness back upon itself, and like a Ulysses returned home it will show that it can still bend the bow. A chorus of admiring bawlers was gathered round Bruno Bauer by this book, and also through the injustice shown by a ministry which deprived him of a lectureship it had not bestowed. Since amongst these admirers the Semitic race was strongly represented, they were somewhat dejected by his *Jewish Question* (1842), in which he came forward in opposition to the cry for the emancipation of the Jews, because he held that it was utterly unreasonable to ask that those who excluded themselves and wished to be the chosen people, should not be excluded. The Jews, in order to arrive at perfect freedom, that is, at a state in which they would have no religion, would have to take many more steps than the Christians, who had almost attained it. Perhaps *Christianity Unveiled* would have conciliated those who had been startled. It was confiscated, however, in the book-shop; and only a single copy, so far as is known, has been preserved. It works out what is in substance the same thought, that the Christian is in the most favourable position for rising to the freedom enjoyed by Atheists, while the Jew has scarcely any alternative but to pass through Christianity.

5. Feuerbach and Bruno Bauer do not however stand to Strauss only in a negative relation, as is implied in what was often asserted at the time, that Feuerbach’s *Essence of Christianity* leaves Strauss’ *Doctrine of Faith* as far behind as Bruno Bauer’s *Synoptics* does his *Life of Jesus*. Their position rather is the direct opposite to his, as they themselves declared when they said, that while he calls himself a pantheist they call themselves atheists; and every one will agree with Feuerbach (*Thesis towards a Reform of Philosophy*), that Atheism is just Pantheism reversed. If, accordingly, Feuerbach does not, like Bruno Bauer, conduct a polemic directly against Strauss, he does so indirectly, since he attacks just those very Hegelian propositions which Strauss most firmly maintained, as for instance, amongst others, that God knows Himself in man. From this contrast between them
it necessarily follows that Strauss, to whom every man is merely a specimen, should despise the masses, should be conservative in politics, should place above all else that form of thinking which is free from all idiosyncrasy, should write with a plastic, unimpassioned calm, should live in Spinozistic seclusion. Feuerbach, again, who so often repeats the statement that the subject cannot be repeated, that it is difficult to understand how he can escape immortality, is destructive in politics, always writes with passion, must have company (subjects) about him, even though it is thoroughly bad; and Bauer identifies things to such an extent with a subject as to speak of the "seven-year-long sufferings of science" exactly in the style of Feuerbach, when he renounced his professorship and said, "Philosophy has now ceased to be a profession." Bauer's style, too, mirrors the constant self-absorption of the subject in itself. Thus, for Strauss, philosophy became a doctrine of "all is one," while for the two others it was a doctrine of self-consciousness or of personality. For this reason the former exalts Spinoza especially, while the two latter find their spiritual comrades and models in the eighteenth century. Up to this point there is no other sign of difference between Feuerbach and Bauer, than that which necessarily arose from their entirely different individualities, and just because their standpoint is subjectivism. In one point, however, they soon differ. Bruno Bauer, in the two anonymous works, The Trumpets of the Judgment Day on Hegel the Atheist and Antichrist (Leipsic, 1841), and Hegel's Theory of Religion and Art Judged from the Standpoint of Faith (1842), seeks, under the mask of a pietist, to prove that Hegel agreed entirely with the atheists of the eighteenth century, and that therefore the present Bruno Bauer was a pure Hegelian. Feuerbach, again, when the authorship of the Trumpets was attributed to him, wrote an essay entitled, An Estimate of the Work: The Essence of Christianity (1847), in which he says that his present teaching, so far from being an unfolding of Hegelian theories, on the contrary originated in opposition to these theories. If any one is to be called his forerunner, let it be Schleiermacher. Hegel's theory, he asserts, is entirely religious, and therefore it belongs to the Old Testament of philosophy. (He afterwards said that the so-called Right Wing of the Hegelian school was the one which was in complete harmony with the master.)
and Atheism was far from adding strength to the Right. The result rather was, that the latter was placed between two fires, and, owing to the undeniable fact that the more brilliant talent was on the side of the opponents, fell into a not very flourishing state. It is true that the Right was no more silent in reference to the theological question than in reference to the others, but its voice died away pretty much unheard. Hinrichs, in a criticism on Michelet’s *History of the Last Systems* (*Hallische Jahrbücher*, 1839, p. 457 ff.), expressed himself in regard to this pretty much after the fashion of Göschel. I attempted in my work, *Nature and Creation* (Leipsic, 1840), and in a treatise closely connected with it, though published at a much later date: *The Philosophy of Religion as Phenomenology of the Religious Consciousness* (in: *Vermischte Schriften*, Leipsic, 1845), to develop a cardinal point of this question, namely, the idea of creation, in such a way as to show how the relation between the physical and religious ways of looking at things, as well as the idea of miracle, might be made intelligible. I sought also to prove that, since the different religions show different stages of consciousness, the philosophy of religion, just because it is at one point necessarily an explanation of myths, absolutely may not be this at another. Gabler contributed *The Hegelian Philosophy, Contributions towards a Right Judgment and Estimate of the Same*, First (and only) Part, Berlin, 1843. This was originally a criticism of Trendelenburg’s *Logical Investigations*, and in it the Hegelian philosophy was given a place nearer to Mysticism than to unbelief, while Pantheism was described as error, and Atheism as absurdity. Reinhold Schmidt, a native of Livonia, and Joh. Wilh. Hanne, a native of Brunswick,—both of whom afterwards abandoned this standpoint, but went in quite different directions,—wrote respectively, *The Christian Religion and the Hegelian Philosophy* (Berlin, 1837), and *Rationalism and Speculative Theology in Brunswick* (Brunswick, 1838). Göschel’s book has been already referred to above. Even if,—which was not the case,—the Right Wing of the Hegelian school had been able to bring men into the field who could have coped with Strauss and Bauer in theological learning, even if it could have arrayed against them an acuteness such as was possessed by the former and which constantly reminds us of Lessing, a gift of musing self-absorption such as characterized the latter, or finally, the force of a Feuerbach, which, though it early showed a certain
tendency to cynicism, was always full of power,—it would have fallen far short of the Left, in so far as influence upon the reading public was concerned. The reason of this lies in the fact, that Hegel's teaching had been taken up by the Left in a one-sided and abstract way; and the great majority of people always prefer what one can become fanatical about, and this is never anything but what is abstract. The concrete, in which opposite determinations are united together, appears to most, according as the ethical or the intellectual standard is applied, to be either a timid half-measure or confused thought. The man who definitely takes up one side everywhere gains the day. If Strauss, in reference to the Dilemma, reminds Hegel that it is not only profound thinking which disregards contradiction, the majority of people still ignore the fact that profound thinking also does it; and acuteness, which, in order to make absurdity impossible, renounces profound thinking, is—as it was also in this instance—sure of success.

7. In what was last remarked is also involved the reason why the works of two men who have already been referred to several times as disinclined to extremes, were so little studied in a thorough way, when they published books in which all the questions hitherto discussed were treated in a style which was generally associated with the Centre of the School. Vatke's book was at least praised; but how little it was actually read, is evident when we remember that in Schwartz's much-lauded History of the most Recent Theology, at all events in the first edition, it was not once mentioned. Conradi's book found quite as few readers, and not even a single appreciative one. Weisse's opinion, that Vatke's book was the most solid one which had appeared for years in the Hegelian school, may be supplemented by mentioning Conradi's alongside of it. K. Conradi, in his Critique of Christian Dogmas According to the Method of the Apostles' Creed (Berlin, 1841), holds that the evangelical history should not be criticized, but only dogmas, and so takes up the latter in their most primitive form and where they have just sprung out of history and are still held together by historical threads, namely, in the Apostles' Creed. He then shows how in each locus which is examined in accordance with the three articles, reflection discovers contradictions which are done away with by means of speculation. To the difficulty which lies in the subject itself there is added in Conradi's book the further difficulty, that his manner of uniting phenom-
enological and ontological investigations, which has been already twice remarked upon, is in no work carried so far as in this one. He has here made use of the right he claims of touching quite shortly on what he had previously more fully developed; and he exercises this right even where his views have in the meantime undergone alteration. This is a point to which Weisse, in his review in Fichte's Zeitschrift (VIII., 2), rightly called attention. Thus it has come about, that people have read out of,—or, as he would perhaps say, read into,—his profound constructive ideas and his acute denials, both Strauss' worship of Genius and Schleiermacher's impersonal but person-making Saviour, the orthodox doctrine of immortality, and the assertion that Christ, in order to be a Redeemer, had to be the greatest transgressor. While Conradi's work already proclaims by its title that all dogmas are to be discussed in it, this is really done also in Vatke's work, although it is brought forward only as a monograph on *Human Freedom in its Relation to Sin and Divine Grace* (Berlin, 1841). He declares at the very beginning, that he is equally opposed to the standpoint which passes for orthodox, according to which God is regarded as finite individual personality, and to pantheism, which looks on the personality of God as the sum of human personalities. He further opposes the view, which was at all events supported by Hegel, that the philosophy of religion has to get a grasp only of the subject-matter of dogmatics, not also of that of theological ethics; while at the same time he maintains that religion in its innermost essence is worship, is an inner reconciliation of self-consciousness and will with God, with which speculation can never come into conflict, though it certainly may do so with dogma. The investigation is divided into three sections, of which the first treats of the will in general, the second of the will in the sphere of subjective religion, and the third of the will in the sphere of objective morality. In the first section, it is specially worthy of note, that he lays stress on what most Hegelians forget, holding, that by the Absolute,—he ought to have said, by the Absolute Spirit,—speculation understands, not what according to religious conceptions is called God, but the kingdom of the spirit, God in unity with his kingdom. (If Vatke had not made such repeated mention of God where he ought to have said kingdom of heaven, there would not have been such an outcry about his statement, that the Absolute Spirit is not
personal, but more than personal). The second section is the most important, but also the most difficult. He goes over all the single moments of the subjective will which constitute the presuppositions necessary for those complicated relations in connection with which we can first begin to speak of good and evil. (Accordingly, in the narrative of the Fall, what lasted through centuries is compressed into a moment.) It is then further shown how, through the relation to God and His law, evil becomes sin, and he maintains that the latter is necessary only that it may cease to be. The ideal of human development would be reached, when evil entered into the will only in so far as was necessary to awaken conscience, but in that case existed only as something which had been overcome and was simply a possibility. The impossibility of such religious strength of mind, particularly under special circumstances, cannot be demonstrated. He then takes up the one-sided methods of explaining the origin of evil, and the equally one-sided views as to the relation of human freedom to divine activity, and at the same time discusses trinitarian and christological questions, and the different way in which God works in nature and in the sphere of freedom, from which the impossibility of miracles is supposed to follow. The third section shows how, by means of a religious transfiguration, moral communities become a kingdom of God, in which, as in the glorified Christ,—though not in Christ as reduced to a single personality,—the fulness of God dwells through the manifoldness of spiritual gifts. To evil and to sin, as mentioned in the first section, there corresponds here the immoral, in the destruction and utilizing of which Providence consists. The final result is, that the kingdom of God, once become a Church, transforms everything, art and science, into a means of grace, and, while at once militant and triumphant, approaches nearer to the goal where God is free Spirit for free spirits, where His will is recognised and willed as the will of free spirits, and where His love is concentrated in the focus of grateful reciprocal love. Even those who are of opinion that Vatke here approaches too near to pantheism, will feel themselves essentially benefited by the thorough study of his work, of which not even a careful epitome, much less a mere table of contents like the above, can give an idea.
C—PHENOMENA IN THE SPHERES OF ETHICS AND POLITICS.

§ 339.

1. Every one will at least have become doubtful of ascribing an orthodox character to the school in which only the small handful composing the Right Wing keeps to orthodoxy; and, indeed, the most celebrated member of this side, Göscher, often does not know what to think, not of orthodoxy, but of the Hegelian philosophy. With the destruction of the second work of restoration, the first was not in any way thereby re-established. The dialectic method passed into entire oblivion in the disputes which have been characterized. Strauss never employed it in his writings; and if he reminds us of the dilemma of Hegel, he at the same time also hinted that the solution of contradictions was not the chief thing. On the other side, Gabler seeks to escape the reproach that the Hegelian God was just the Hegelian method, by pronouncing it to be of secondary importance. But if it is all over with the logical foundation of the system, and with its orthodoxy, then there remains only the third point, which was brought forward (§ 331, 1) in order to show how Hegel was a philosopher of restoration. If in the discussions on the fundamental principles of the moral life, views should be broached which unite atomistic ethics and revolutionary politics with the negative position in the two points already treated, there will be no reason whatever for asserting that these views are in agreement with those of Hegel. At most, the honour will be left him of having been the starting-point. This is the reason why, if in the first section the anti-Hegelians monopolized the discussion, and the Hegelians in the second, in this section that will be done by those who go beyond Hegel, and are thus ultra-Hegelians.

2. Richard Rothe’s *Beginnings of the Christian Church and of its Constitution* (first volume; Wittenberg, 1837), appears as a prophetic announcement that scientific interest will soon be diverted from religious to political questions. (Rothe was born January 28, 1799; in 1823 he became chaplain to the Prussian Embassy; from 1828 to 1837 he was professor in the Seminary at Wittenberg; from 1837 onwards, with the exception of the years 1849–54, when he was in Bonn, he was professor in Heidelberg; he died in this capacity on the
20th. August, 1867.) In this work a man, celebrated for his gifts as a preacher, and for his thorough piety, sought to carry out the thought that the Church no longer corresponds to the Christian life, as a form in which it can be realized, but that the State alone does this, though certainly not a State which has any kind of Church attached to it, but one which has absorbed the religious life after the dissolution of its ecclesiastical setting. The fact that it is just the cultured who are becoming estranged from the Church, and are turning full of hope to a State-life, presents an approach to that condition of things which the seer beholds, in whose new Jerusalem there stands no temple. This State of the future will, as the Church did formerly, overleap the limits of nationality, not in the form of a universal State, but as an organism of States. This State, which undoubtedly lies beyond the present, though not beyond the earth,—but, on the contrary, is always realizing itself more and more on the earth,—has, along with the religious element, absorbed the artistic element as well; and national festivals constitute its proper form of worship. In the course of the investigation, Hegel and Schleiermacher are designated as those who had the profoundest conception, the one of the State, the other of religion. This book of Rothe's, which was described by many at the time as the counterpart of Strauss' Life of Jesus,—because it annihilates the Church just as Strauss' book annihilates the Founder of the Church,—was just for this reason hailed with delight by many anti-Hege- lians, because they said it shows to what the Hegelian philosophy leads, namely, to pagan deification of the State.

§ 340.

1. The very thing which Rothe's book announced as likely to happen, actually did take place through the instrumentality of the Hallische Jahrbücher, the history of which, as the Editor afterwards said, is really a part of the history of the time. The originality of the two principal editors, Arnold Ruge (born 1802; from 1832 to 1841 Privatdocent in Halle; lived afterwards in Dresden and Paris, and finally in England [Ruge died Dec. 31, 1880, at Brighton.—Ed.]), and Theodor Echtermeyer (Teacher in the normal school at Halle, then in Dresden, where he died in 1842), each of whom was the complement of the other, and the fact that they had an ener-
getic publisher in perfect sympathy with them, enabled them to bring out this journal under the most favourable auspices, on January 1st, 1838. The very first article, on the Halle University, which was the joint composition of the two editors (1838, pp. 1 ff. and 665 ff.), shows that the standpoint of the *Jahrbücher* was that of the Hegelian philosophy; and it is especially pointed out that to Ruge belongs the credit of having been the first to introduce the youth of Halle to its metaphysical depths. Later, Ruge challenges any one to mention a single point in which he departs from Hegel's views; and he volunteers to read a *privatissimum* on Hegel's *Logik* for Leo. Other contributors call Hegel the centre round which the present turns (pp. 348, 770), so that the strictures of Feuerbach on Hegel, to the effect that he did not sufficiently recognise the importance of Fichte (p. 46), passed all the more unheeded, since Feuerbach himself, in his criticism of empiricism, explains that in principle he is at one with Hegel (p. 582). If it is considered besides, that although in the course of the year 1848, Strauss (*On Justinus Kerner*, p. 6) and Vischer (*Strauss and the Württembergers*, p. 449) had supplied most attractive essays, both were kept from taking up theological questions, in accordance with the principle of the *Jahrbücher*; that the editors explain that they do not share the view according to which the existence of the Absolute in Christ is impossible (p. 1101), that they reject Carove’s deism and humanism (p. 1435), congratulate themselves on the respect shown to what is positive in contrast to rationalism (p. 611), take religion under their protection, and defend it against Heine and Feuerbach’s *Leibnitz*, as well as the Church against the attacks of Rothe (pp. 1073, 1154), call Göschel a man of great ability, say that philosophy and dogma differ only as regards form (pp. 1884, 1888), describe the moderate deists and the Jews as heretics in reference to the free spirit of the age (pp. 1177, 1187); then, if we regard the Centre of the Hegelian school as the standpoint occupied at that time by the *Jahrbücher* in the form in which the Centre was represented by Vatke and Conradi, these two are perhaps placed too far in the direction of the Left. As regards politics, the *Jahrbücher* showed a decidedly Prussian colouring, as came out, for instance, in the review of Görres’ *Athanasius* (pp. 481, 729), without however raising the suspicion of intentional exaggeration which intruded itself in other places owing to the large type
in which the complements paid to the Prussian Government and administration were printed. Parallels between Prussia and France always resulted in favour of the former, and it seemed indisputable that the monarchical system was the best.

2. That the *Jahrbücher* had made a change of front, to which Feuerbach's previously mentioned essay on positive philosophy already pointed (p. 2305),—an essay, be it said, into which the editors inserted a *captatio benevolentiae* for the Hegelian school which is not Feuerbach's,—became much more evident in the issue of the year 1839. This appears already in the Preface, which casts off the fetters of an exclusive school from the *Jahrbücher*, and assures its readers that it is able to survive the withdrawal of less pietistically inclined men (*i.e.* Göschel, among others). It was further seen in two notices by Ruge of Bretschneider's *Baron Sandau* and Strauss' *Permanent and Transient* (1839, pp. 77, 94), in which a warning was given against despising rationalism, a habit which, it was said, was common amongst profound speculative fools. Göschel is attacked by Echtermeyer in the sphere of aesthetics (p. 153), and by Ruge in that of the history of religion. The admittance of Strauss' masterly essay on Schleiermacher and Daub (p. 97) shows that the theological sphere was no longer closed for him. The essay on Pietism and Jesuitism (p. 241) pronounces every philosophy which justifies dogma, to be pious philosophy with a purpose, and treats the dialectic method ironically, by applying it to the irrational. It is true that religion is still extolled, but only in the form of Protestantism, in contrast to old lumber. Wherein this consists, is a point left indefinite. The fact that Feuerbach's *Philosophy and Christianity* was prevented from appearing in the *Jahrbücher* solely by the action of the press censor, shows what position it already had taken up in regard to religion. When, accordingly, Hinrichs, in a criticism upon Michelet (p. 465), declared himself opposed to the views of the latter, the editors, by slight insertions, made him say things about the Right Wing which he had never thought of saying. The opposite view to that of the Right Wing constantly gained more ground in the *Jahrbücher*. We soon find it said that dogmatics ought simply to be the history of dogmas; that nobody can believe and know, for the one is incompatible with the other (p. 496). In the notice of the evangelical histories by Neander and Weisse, Georgii de-
scribes the standpoint of religion as dualism, and as therefore incompatible with philosophy, which asserts the existence only of what is here and now. Ruge, who had just expressed himself with a good deal of diplomacy regarding Strauss' worship of genius, now finds fault only with its aristocratism, which is disproved, for instance, by the indiscriminate out-pouring of the spirit at the Leipsic Reformation festival (pp. 985, 1329). The very full essay on the Schiller festival in Stuttgart (p. 1097), commends the fact that here we have the celebration of the true revelation of God, that which is given in genius. Rosenkranz, i.e., the Centre, comes in for his turn, after the Jahrbücher had broken with the Right. Bayerhof reads him a lecture (p. 1391), because he is coqueting with orthodoxy, and believes in immortality. Feuerbach finally gives a criticism of the Hegelian system (p. 1657) in which he rejects its principal points, viz. the way in which it begins with the absence of all presuppositions, the importance which is conceded to negation, the subordinate place given to nature. In the same way, in an essay on Goldschmidt's European Pentarchy (p. 1729), Hegel is reproached with having brought, by his old German romanticism, so many of his pupils into bondage. The last remark points to the alteration which this year had brought with it in reference to politics. On the occasion of the appearance of Förster's war-songs, and in connection with the Berlin volunteer festival (p. 433), the Prussian patriotism of the Jahrbücher was still at its height. Now, however, Ruge, under the mask of a Württemberger (p. 2089), writes a description of the Prussian Government and the hitherto so much lauded bureaucracy, in which he turns the "State of intelligence" into ridicule; and Biedermann in Leipsic examines the Prussian State-principle, and finds that it is entirely steeped in Catholicism (p. 2277). The greatest sensation of this year is occasioned by the joint "Manifesto" of the editors on "Romanticism and Protestantism," in which the idea of Romanticism is so defined as to include all fixed adherence to the ideas which had been surmounted by means of Protestantism, to include therefore the standpoint of the fixed idea. It was out of policy, Ruge subsequently says, that they had here confined themselves to the domain of philosophy and aesthetics; the main purpose from the beginning had been a political one. The fact that Hegel is here put in contrast with
Romanticism, the culminating point of which is to be found in Schelling, and this after Feuerbach had proved that he had simply completed the System of Identity, produces a singular impression.

3. During the year 1840, in which the Jahrbücher rapidly follows the new course it has entered upon, the essays which have a theological interest, or, speaking generally, any strictly scientific interest, as for example Vatke’s review of Jul. Müller’s frequently reprinted book on Sin (2 vols., Breslau), give place to the popular discussion of practical questions, Echtermeyer seldom wrote, and Ruge all the oftener. A joyful announcement that Feuerbach was engaged on a critique of impure reason, was followed by the fourth article of the Manifesto, in which the old Hegelians are reproached with idleness, induced, says the Manifesto, by the master. They contemplate the historical process of the world, instead of taking part in what is practical; and their romantic cue makes them unjust to what is useful, to Nicolai and the Enlightenment. An essay, Europe in the Year 1840, vindicates hegemony for France, and lays down the position that there is only one Atheism, namely doubt in reference to the spirit of history. Köppen sings the praises of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, which, and not the Reformation, begins the modern period, and jeers at the Hegelians, for whom Hegel’s Logie replaces the Veda, while Ruge affirms that Brahma’s kingdom is at an end. In an essay on Von Gagern and Hegel, he blames the latter for having abandoned the Theory of Contract, for having taken corporate bodies under his protection, for closing his system with religion instead of with universal history and the modern State. He gives an enthusiastic welcome to Bruno Bauer’s National Church, and extols the Prussian State, because it has annihilated the Church. In another essay, the Hegelians are ridiculed for the orthodoxy with which they stick to the Encyclopedia; and Hegel himself is ridiculed for his idealism, which prevents him from seeing that spirit embodies itself at the present time in steam and iron, and that money, without which there is no industry, is the true idealist. Another writer calls the Hegelian philosophy, scholasticism, court-philosophy, a patching-up. It may be imagined, accordingly, with what delight the announcement of Strauss’s Doctrine of Faith was received by the Jahrbücher.
4. In the Preface to the fourth year's issue (1841) the banner of rationalism and liberalism is raised, and complaints are made about the state of things in Prussia. It is declared that there is need of a free university, which, however, must be situated outside of Prussia. The _Leipziger Allgemeine Zeitung_ is censured for not having more energetically taken up the cause of the Magdeburg magistracy against the devil's preacher Kämpfe. This year's issue contains nothing from the pen of Strauss; but Vischer contributed an essay on the Tübingen dogmatic professors, in which he states the view that a time may come when there will be no Church, a state of things of which there seemed reason to be apprehensive, since the "National Church," and along with it the _Jahrbücher_, had proclaimed that there is no Church. Speaking generally, the moment was visibly approaching when Strauss was to appear as one who has lagged behind. Bruno Bauer's previously-mentioned treatise on the Christian State is the last note-worthy essay which the _Jahrbücher_, as the _Hallische Jahrbücher_, contained. From July 1841 onwards, it appeared as the _Deutsche Jahrbücher_; and Ruge justifies this emigration from Prussia to Germany in the Preface, which reproaches the Hegelians with their threefold orthodoxy, which was at once philosophical, theological, and political. All the shreds of dishonesty in which the _Jahrbücher_ had draped itself are henceforth to be thrown aside, and it is to present itself free from Christianity, which had been shaken to its foundations by Strauss and exposed in all its emptiness by Feuerbach, but above all to declare war against political servitude, against the theories of feudalism and property. Nauwerk and Edgar Bauer,—a brother of Bruno—contributed essays, all of which concern the domain of politics. Ruge, in the essay, _Protestant Absolutism_, demands a State in which the king will be the first servant. In a more incidental way it is declared, that as Feuerbach's _Essence of Christianity_ had rendered Strauss' _Doctrine of Faith_ antiquated, so Bruno Bauer's _Synoptics_ had done the same for his _Life of Jesus_. The sole merit of the Hegelian philosophy, as of every philosophy, is, that it has freed many from prejudices. If any one reaches the goal more quickly without it, so much the better.

5. In the last year's issue of the _Deutsche Jahrbücher_ (1842), a demand is made apropos of a political work by Theodor Romer for a constitutional monarchy, but with a
single chamber. In April, Ruge makes it known that difficulties occasioned by the censorship of the press in Saxony necessitated writing essays in a diplomatic vein, and affirms that the philosophical parhésia belongs to the future. In July, there once more appears a manifesto, which places the essence of Romanticism in the maintenance of what is Christian, and therefore in Jesuitism. Nauwerk sets up Radicalism as the true view, in opposition to ideas of reform. Ruge ridicules the Christian State, calls the War of Liberation a war of restoration, jeers at the Germans on account of their feeling of nationality, and at the Prussians for their compulsory military service, that pendant of a universal sacerdotalism. As Nauwerk had extolled the future as the epoch of democracy, so also Ruge says in the Preface to the issue of the year 1843,—with which the Jahrbücher comes to an end, and in which liberalism is made to criticise itself, that the time is at hand in which the Church must make way for the school, and liberalism for democracy. After the Jahrbücher had been prohibited in Saxony, Ruge left Germany. In Paris he brought out some parts of the Deutsch-französische Jahrbücher (1844). In the following year his Two Years in Paris appeared (Leipsic, 1845), and the issue of his Collected Works began in 1846 (10 vols. Mannheim). After his return to Saxony, in the year 1846, he directed the reform movement, first in Leipsic, and then, after he had been for a long period member of the Frankfort Parliament, in Berlin. After the year 1850 he lived in England, and gave to the public a translation of Buckle's History of Civilization in England (Leipsic, 1860), as well as the beginning of his Autobiography; and in these, likewise, he showed his spiritual kinship with the men of the eighteenth century.

§ 341.

1. Just when the Jahrbücher had come to an end, Edgar Bauer, who up to this time had been known only by some essays which he wrote in it, began his political lucubrations, which landed him first in prison and then forced him to go to England as a refugee. He was not only the foe of constitutional monarchy, but of every form of State in which piety, i.e., religion, is of any importance whatever. Since, however, there is no State in which this condition of things does not
exist, he demands that the State should cease. Man is no longer to be a political animal, i.e., a mere cit, but a free member of society, simply an individual, without king, without marriage, without private possessions, without nationality and national peculiarities—exempt, in short, from all moral bonds. Since he attempts to transport himself into this position, he asserts that it is unjust for one who, like himself, does not recognise the idea of majesty to be condemned as an insulter of majesty, and to be condemned in accordance with the Prussian common law, the authority of which he does not at all admit.

2. When, however, the worth, not only of religion and the Church, but also of the State and of every moral organism was thus denied, or, as it was now expressed, was subjected to criticism; and seeing that criticism, as applied both to religion and politics, has completed its work, criticism may appear to be at a loss for an object. However singular it may now seem that Bruno Bauer and his brother should have made the attempt to place themselves at the standpoint of pure criticism, i.e., of criticism, not of this or that object, but of criticism in abstracto, still this step was actually necessary. It was in truth already taken when philosophy first constituted itself as a theory of self-consciousness, when, that is, the Science of Knowledge issued in Irony (vid. § 314, 3). Only in the present case the self-deification of the All-destroying Ego seems to be much more logical, i.e., more abstract, than in the case of Schlegel. This standpoint was much more clearly developed in the Literaturzeitung edited by Bruno Bauer (Charlottenburg, 1844), than in Edgar Bauer's Conflict of Criticism with Church and State. In both, the doctrine is proclaimed that there is no truth in anything but man, and that therefore even the word atheism, because it contains a relation to the object denied, is not the correct designation for the views of the free man. For this very reason the free man must not assume that anything has absolute value. Everything is posited only in order that it may be denied; as soon as it is recognised it ceases to be true. Criticism does not bring us satisfaction; he who will have recognised truths, let him go to religion. So far Edgar. Bruno, again, at a time when a large circle of young literati, mostly Jewish, thronged round him as his admirers, and changed every word he uttered into a stereotyped phrase, which was again trumpeted abroad by the