HEGEL’S DIALECTICS: A FRAGMENT\(^1\)

Ernst Troeltsch\(^2\)

[1922]

Hegel’s dialectics from the beginning is put together from a whole series of the most important and very different philosophical elements. The first and fundamental one is Leibniz’ doctrine of a rising progress, transferring the unconscious element of reason into consciousness and systematical unity. With this Leibniz for the first time showed, against theological doctrines of providence, materialistic constructions of laws and chronistical [sic] or courteous style of description, a uniform basis of history in the ascent of the mind, arising from nature, becoming independent and progressing according to inner spiritual necessities. This was still far from the thoughts of the most acute historical brain of the Renaissance, Machiavelli, who contended himself with a psychologically acutely seen typization [sic] of history as [a] means of instruction for present action. The history of Aufklärung aside and after Leibniz followed more the naïve reasoning and optimism of the time, believing the general cultural progress to be a matter of course consequence of finally freed reason. It did not think of metaphysical foundations and, as far as it had such, these foundations, the deism, only released the striving toward utility. The connection itself was merely a psychological-causal one. Leibniz’ monad only brought individuality, connection of a single and total consciousness, connection of occurrences in the latter, universality and inner necessity of world-becoming and thereby also of historical becoming. It developed these consequences, however, slowly and late. Their effects are shown but in Lessing and Kant, Winckelmann and Moeser, Herder and Goethe; they reveal themselves the strongest in Fichte, Hegel’s predecessor. The ascent according to this doctrine was a logical-continual one and, because of the conscious aim being contained in it, in the unconscious beginning already a uni-

\(^1\) From the unpublished “Historism and its Problems”, Chapter III, Part Two (pp. 36-64) an English translation of a fragment from Troeltsch’s Historismus (1922). The document is housed within the James Luther Adams collection, Box 118-119, Syracuse University Library. Published by NYJS with the permission of Syracuse University. Direct all correspondence to M. Worrell (editor): mark.worrell@cornland.edu. The text has been reproduced virtually unaltered except for a very light editorial hand relating to matters of punctuation, obvious typographical errors, etc. All footnotes (bottom of pages utilizing Arabic numerals) are by the editor; all endnotes are Troeltsch’s.

\(^2\) The Protestant theologist Ernst Troeltsch (1865-1923) is best remembered among sociologists as a close friend of Max Weber and author of The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches. For more on Troeltsch see: http://people.bu.edu/wwildman/bce/troeltsch.htm

This document is interesting not only for what Troeltsch says about Hegel but also, elsewhere in this text, his assertion that it was Marx and Hegel that were the greatest influences on Max Weber’s whole outlook on history. The part that Hegel played in the formation of interpretive sociology has been under-appreciated and having insight into Troeltsch’s interpretation of Hegel, in the absence of Weber’s analysis, tells us quite a bit about the Weber circle’s attitude toward German Idealism.
formly understandable one. Its laws were those of thinking itself, which progresses from obscurity to clarity, from accidentally to unity, forming in fact the kernel of all not immediately intellectual functions and therefore subjecting their movement to the laws of progressive thinking. Progress is a continual increase of values, but formally only, not in the matter itself, because the always identical content of reason is clarified only, this clarification indeed meaning and immense profit for the subjects. That what is already contained in nature and then in the dull psychical life, becomes value for itself, alive and active subject, comprehending itself and in itself God and the world. The general, universal-historical and finally cosmic movement has been attained from the single one, from the monadological interpretation of empiric individualities. That is the deciding foundation.”

To this comes as the second and almost as important element the heirloom of Kant’s and Fichte’s philosophy of moral, considering this process not only as that of logically and continually progressing intellect, but as that of active will, enforcing reason against the opposition of sensuality and self-love. Here, also, general reason and its movement [were] got out of the backgrounds of the empiric I. Here also the foundation was a thus won uniform reason, but one including the practical object and culminating therefore not in the intellect, but in the practical will. Here also the process arose from inner laws of reason, meaning an increase of values by infinite approach, which realizes the striving to freedom, lying in the essence of reason, in a region of ethical reason with mutual appreciation and encouragement. But here the process went through fights and contrasts, which were not to be clarified logical contradictions, but practical-moral fights and real contrasts. Even thus, however, the opinion remained that just through these fights and contrasts the region of reason was stimulated, concentrated and enforced itself. All this finally meant a historical-philosophical insight only into end and aim, offering to historical knowledge itself only the at first still sterile or at least vague insight into the continuity, uniform motivation and the nature, merely following inner laws, of historical becoming.

Here began Hegel’s own original historical capacity, in which he is closely related to and probably often inspired by Herder’s sense for the original, the vital, the individual and the contrary. He therefore saw in individual and empiric historical proceedings real and vital contrasts, from which all actual proceedings grow, and considered these neither in Leibniz’ manner as mere obscurities of actually existing logical continuity, nor in Kant’s moralizing manner as [a] fight between sensuality and ethical self-determination. He rather believed that in these thus produced forms, greatness, wealth, passion and abundance of historical life revealed themselves. By that, the center of gravity of historical thinking moved away from the beginning as well as from the end of world-happening, shifting completely in its alive middle or in its ever immediate presence, which lives, creates and fights not because of any aim, but because of itself. It is a Goethean feeling of immediateness and vitality of all reality in its place and of the unthinkable wealth of the productions of world-reason, transferred from Goethe’s conception of nature to history, with which Goethe himself did not much know what to begin. Hegel chiefly sees not the logical and not the ethical progress of reason, but the effects and expressions of a reason, continually fighting and [reconciling], dispersing and collecting, shallowing and
culminating in historical life. Yet he also held on to the progressive increase of values of reason, thus clarifying, deepening and strongly enforcing itself, therein following the Christian-eschatological tradition of the Occident and its secularization and rationalization to progress, but seeking the latter with Leibniz not in the objective content, but in the form of consciousness around this content.

With this but began the real problem. The reality of contrasts and fights, the contradiction of life, endlessly differentiating itself, must be accepted into the uniformity, continuity and striving towards aims of reason, which was to give to the whole uniformity of the principle and law or rhythm of becoming, if one wanted to get beyond mere interesting description and beyond Herder’s insufferable confusions of laws of sensualistic adaptation, of providential world-rule, of rationalistic moralizing, individual formation and pantheistic melting together. The genuine and true reality of historical contrasts, in which alone greatness, passion, individuality, catastrophe and reconstruction occur, must [be existing] and effective, of reason striving to its clarity and self-comprehension. Each present must contain the full meaning of historical life and by that at the same time arrange itself into the law of changes of this meaning. This meaning must be individually alive and once ever present and yet one only in all appearances. Not the bad infinity of ethical striving and not the contrast of sensual dullness and logical clearness, but the vital unity of happening in the particularity of real and contrary formations; not the overcoming of moral tensions or those according to reflection toward the aim, but the penetration and combination of the single one at each point with the whole: that is presupposition and aim to the son of the Goethean period, turning away from dualism and spirit of progress of the Aufklärung. Autonomous scientific penetration of history also as a logical unity he shares with the former, the supple, full of nuances, plastical [sic] sense for the concrete, always in the first line representing itself, with the second one.†

Now the great question arose: how to connect both? That is the work of dialectic, which is nothing else but the doctrine of the identity of contrasts, while at the same time these contrasts have full reality, logic of motion which does not, like the common, superficial logic, clinging to appearance, teach that motion cannot be understood and that contrasts exclude each other, but that they flow into each other and change themselves in the motion of becoming. For becoming there was no concept up that time, and Leibniz’ dissolution of becoming into infinitely small changes was no true and genuine becoming. This latter can be comprehended by a deeper penetrating logic only, which, like once Nikolaus von Kues, recognizes in the coincidentis oppositorum the final and actual problem of thinking. The concept of becoming is a relative suspension of the doctrine of contradiction, which applies to being considered as dead only. The latter is the world of intellect, the former that of reason.‡

Thus, the Cusaner’s obscure metalogic and Leibniz’ mythical reestablished harmony is to be changed into a real logic of motion of pluralism and monism at once. This logic of becoming and of metamorphosis is pressed upon us nowhere as immediately as by history, in which we ourselves are this becoming, and logic of becoming our own self-understanding only: a different one many moment and yet a
uniform being. Therefore, as Vico already believed history to be the logically most penetrable part of reality, because it is our own life and product, Hegel, in [his] History, in the first line gets clear this fundamental problem of becoming, penetrating from there only his whole world-picture and world-thinking with the spirit of the dynamics evident in such logic. It belongs to the essence of mind not to rest, to progress from each position to its own contrast, and to observe from here again the unity of this contrast with the original position. That demands the fundamental assumption as to the essence of mind, that is a principle of motion, of identity expressing and realizing itself in contrasts only, and the exact working through of the logical consequence of such a fundamental essentiality of the mind. This lies before us in its well-known triadic arrangement of happening into affirmation, negation and negation of negation or re-affirmation. This new logical law can be applied to the whole of human history as well as to any single part or branch, to be separated by the historian, and because of that contains in the latter case also always at once the whole. For the essential in history to its understanding is the law of motion itself, in which the individual and the general are originally and concretely combined at each point and yet all the single one arises from motion and returns to motion, because this itself is the actual whole, each point being a form of change of the whole only. It has been quite obviously gone out form the empiric-single one, and its all-penetrating background, historical dynamics in itself, been made abstractly independent only.§

Yet, if this logic of history reveals the deepest essence of the logical, then this historical logic cannot be restricted to history, but must comprehend the whole of the world, nature also and the own inner being of the Godhead. The traditional logic of natural sciences can only be logic remaining in the exterior, clinging to mediate impression and its reflecting analysis, not yet observing the whole, can be abstract reflection only, abstracting from the real unity of life and isolating the single in reflection and externally putting it together again. It also must be penetrated into its greater ground, where the same logic of dynamics reveals itself to us. Philosophy of history must have its foundation in a philosophy of nature thought according to the same principles. The contrast of merely reflecting and abstracting logic against concrete logic, mediating all the single from the whole by motion, must go through both regions of science and therefore cannot be a remaining and essential one, but one to be dissolved into the alone full and true logic of motion.... There are two different manners of consideration, extending at the same time over total being, the first of which is [practiced] in the empiric sciences of nature and in the empiric, psychologizing science of history. But it is no parallelism of alternating and equal manners of comprehending, going out from the subject only, but a peripherical [sic] and a central logic, arising from matter, in which the second one finally takes back into itself the first one.

Thus, the problem of the logic of motion was extended from history to one side far across the whole [of] thinking and all science, leading to immeasurable problems, to all of which Hegel of course was not equal. His dissolution of the scientific [sic] logic of reflection into dynamics is, as [a] fundamental idea, not so far [removed] anymore from the natural science of today; Hegel’s own accomplishment, however, was not without reason subjected to notorious derision. But still to an-
other side this historical logic of motion grew deep into the philosophical system, to the side of epistemology. This logic of motion, as it has been described up to now, seems to mean merely a new and extremely intelligent metaphysics, according to which logic simply is a simple reflection of the real in thinking, as in fact that latter has been the opinion of Feuerbach, Marx and Engels. But that was not at all Hegel’s opinion, who as all his companions came from Kant and was determined not at all to do away with his Copernican turn, but, vice versa, to lead it to the [most extreme] consequence. Leibniz’ monad, too, having meant the turning away from west-European metaphysical dualism, sensualism and materialism and thereby opening the possibility of a specifically historical thinking, had been a self-appearance of mind as nature, a picture of itself set from the dynamic activity of the mind. Thus Hegel must strive to understand the reality of nature and history, viewed by means of the dynamic logic of dialectics, at the same time as product and setting of this dialectical mind and to found on this afterwards only its logical penetrability and describability [sic]. This mind, however, could, as with Fichte already, not anymore be the individual and finite logical subject, which with Kant, is an incomprehensible and simply to be accepted in-each-other of the given and logical-subjective forms of understanding and thinking, created a reality scientifically to be arranged, but founded upon an unsolved dualism and therefore ending in irreconcilable antinomies. This mind could only be the divine all-mind itself, which as fundamental activity of its dialectical and moved essentiality, eternally changes from the self-position as absolute activity into self-negation as given finiteness, conquering this eternally forming world-contrasts by the process of world-becoming, ... [a] timeless and purely logical process, which to the finite subject only – one does not quite understand why – seems to be temporal, but incidentally in its dynamics everywhere removes the mere temporal stringing together, pointing to a region of pure in-each-other of diction and contradiction. With that the strict unity of the ground of existence, the law of motion and the clearness of the world-aim has been attained on the way of the new dialectical, in epistemology at once metaphysical, logic.**

The logic of motion has its foundation in a philosophy of identity, in which the all-spirit is identical with the moved expression of itself and therefore can return by analysis from each point of its single realization to itself. From here the Kantian doctrine appears as a merely preliminary stage for Hegel, as a logic of reflection touching reality, produced by reason, only from the side of methods and dissolving itself in the contrast of material and form, of theoretical and practical reason, nature and freedom, finiteness and infinity, appearance and essence. Kant’s idea that the reality produced by reason itself only can be recognizably [sic] penetrated by it seems to him not to be finished. There that dialectical logic was lacking; which knows how to dissolve the contrast between material and form, essence and appearance, antinomies and unity of reason. Dialectic only is the solution of the epistemological problem also and the perfection of the critical method. Now logic of history has no doubts anymore from the epistemological side, but is just from the side securely fastened. The single finite logical subject can, by analysis of itself, its presuppositions and pre-conditions, reconstructs the whole world-process and understand itself as its moment. Historical thinking can from any present situation use the
It is neither possible nor necessary here to follow these difficult theories in detail. One sees without effort, that it is an extremely intelligent, but audacious and violent connection of Kant and Spinoza. The chief thing and the actually ever effective in it is only the dialectical-dynamic logic, by which Hegel was far superior to the related doctrine of Schelling’s, Schleiermacher’s and W. von Humboldt’s,†† and which he was capable, quite different from Fichte, being mainly interested in the final moral aim, of driving really into the historical material. Mainly from this predominance is explained, which he had over all the great philosophers of his period, and the tremendous effect on the historical thinking, or better, on the historizing of the thinking of a whole generation, even to the present day, where the effect remained, even though its presuppositions have been forgotten. Here it is only important to illuminate some conclusions important for the historical thinking and to explain the application of dialectics to the material prepared by empiric-critical investigation. This manner of thinking was charged, but wrongly, with aprioristic construction. It is constructive, using for the means of its construction the a priori of dialectics. But that, as with Kant, is a purely formal a priori and therefore only a means of order and penetration for empiric material. And this a priori is not at all deduced a priori, but merely pointed out as background and content of all thinking according to experience and conceived with the daring “courage of thinking.” Hegel therefore does not intend to eliminate empirically and critically, pragmatically and psychologically proceeding investigation; he rather presupposes them, arranging afterwards only their materials according to the principle of dialectics, where we might wish that investigation and preparation themselves be anointed with a drop of dialectical oil. The dialectical picture of history is the reconstruction of given, descriptive and concrete materials to a whole, not a priorical deduction of occurrences full of content and their sequences from the idea. That is extremely important, though, unfortunately, it has very often been not recognized or misunderstood. To Hegel only the right and healthy relation matters of empirical and critical investigation to construing descriptions. But that today is still the same problem. That the former today is infinitely extended, growing much more from the vital crowd of political, social and economical questions of life that it was possible for those generations of the German Ancient Regime, is another question. Whether dialectics, which anyhow is the discovery of historical dynamics, can still be sufficient for the second one, we shall be able to judge only at the end of the chapter.

With this, a second point is closely connected, which the Young-Hegelians completely misunderstood and put away, but which today also is not yet considered or, if it is, is mostly misinterpreted. As Hegel does not construe at all concrete history a priori, this particularly he does not know any constructions of the future. He knows very well, that his method can be applied only to a spiritual penetration of that which is known already. But that what is known also could not be construed, if the historical process had not attained already its essential and at least fundamental perfection in the Christian-Germanic period. The whole can be construed only if
the whole already exists. As long as one believes essential changes and developments of meaning still to be imminent, there is only practical action, instructed by historical examples, but not the construction of a process, which can be construed only, when the whole is perfected and therefore the ascent leading to it can be exhaustively interpreted from the result. In order to apply Hegel’s method, the time of understanding must have taken the place of the time of productive action. Only at the end philosophy paints gray [on] gray, only at ... twilight Minerva’s bird [owl] takes flight. That belongs organically to the presuppositions of Hegel’s logic of history; without this presupposition it becomes weak and impossible. It is neither a political-reactionary enthusiasm for the Prussia of his time, nor the self-absolutism of the philosopher, caught in his system, not a personal quietistic mood of life, which is expressed in that, but a logical presupposition and consequence, by which alone his whole system is possible. In it, he did not think of the end of the world beginning with it, but of the breaking through of history, to its last and final level, on which it may still move for a long time, forming its fundamental content. Of course, he neither could think of revolution, prophesying of the future, preparation of a new historical world-period. He felt himself destined to belong to the period of principal conclusions, and to seek greatness in the understanding of the past, no in the creating of the future. To the latter task his philosophy of history, in contrast to the views held by myself, had no relation at all and could not have it under the circumstances. Hegel deceived himself as to that, and his [self]-deception indeed weakens his whole method of the logical construction of dynamics; we shall discuss this in a moment. But, as his dynamics only wants spiritually to penetrate the empiric material and in that, in fact, is not bound to the scholastical [sic] method, thus the idea of dynamics itself is not affected by this deception, which moreover gave to most of the judges more occasions to derision than to reason. It is, in fact, the final test as to his being bound to empiricism.

Nor can it be said that this rationalization, possibility of arrangement, transparency and logical necessity of becoming exclude all the irrational, individual, inexpedient and accidental. Hegel is not the constructive fool and fanatic of necessity to dissolve everything into harmony, realization of purpose and necessity, knowing the contrasts of the real as dialectically fertile contrasts only, but not also as mere differences, as merely actual and a-logical obstructions. The whole dynamical process to him, in fact, is a crystallization of conscious reason from the primeval contrast set by it, unconscious reason, pure actuality of being or mere existence. The resistance of “foul existence” against the genuine, striving against the logical necessity and increase of values of the ascent, to him is not everywhere a logically necessary means of transition, but often an actual obstruction and barrier, which must be conquered or may be ignored. Single appearance to him is not at all the abstract manifestation of reason, but the completely concrete, happening once and individual self-greatness, beauty and profundity in itself, but also with the remains and [dross] of the foul existence. Dynamical reason is [not an] evenly flowing one, but culminates tremendously in historical greatness, uses up millions for the sake of short periods of magnificence and aristocratically superior beings, sets into motion the whole apparatus of passions, while the masses lazily stay in the average and thousands of
years and continents have nothing to say to history. Rationalizing the becoming and relating it to the aim is not, as it is mostly understood, without remains. How he could combine that with his pantheistic system of philosophy of identity is another question. Here, as is well known, the late Schelling found very understandable reasons for his doctrines of a contrary tendency and primeval apostasy of finite mind against tending upwards, divine reason. But anyway, the effect of this circumstance on his conception of history is considerable, and one has therefore often made him [into] a theist.‡‡

He had in it a principle of selecting the material. Only the culminating points of becoming, at which self-conception and growing consciousness of reason flash up, together with their presuppositions and pre-conditions, form the object of history, the course of a road of light illuminated by great condensed masses, beside which the masses of those staying behind, the dull ones, accidents and sins, remain in the dark. A principle of selection founded deeply on the matter itself, not only on description and necessity of abbreviation. Thus only the identity of the real and reasonable in him must be understood.

Such an historical selection of the only mattering material of facts and such a side-by-side of the necessary to reason and the indifferent, the staying behind and the dead, is little known to modern thinking, which thinks all historical happening in terms of causality. To it therefore everything is alike useful for explanation and therefore important, which thinks to commit a sin against the spirit of science and to break through causality by an illegitimate teleology, if it lifts a few islands of happening from the great stream. The uninterruptedness [sic] of causality seems to make impossible such a one-sidedness and such a breaking through of the necessity of reason, because reason and necessity are fundamentally known to us as causality only. There is no trace of this in Hegel. Instead of causality he has dialectics. By its fundamental idea of the identity of all contrasts and their logically necessary arising from each other, logical continuity is taken care of, and, as in this arising only the meaning and content of purpose, existing in reason in the beginning already, is being clarified and made conscious, the emphasizing of the most important points of clarification is no breaking through and no lifting out of things of the stream. The lighted tops are the heads of the mountain range, which are formed by the broad dark masses and the range of which hints at and represents the course of the whole mountain chain. The causal and especially the psychological-causal linking together of single processes, however, is a preparatory, cruder and more external, work on the material, where this is beaten into single pieces and then pieced together again, but where the main thing, the stream, the inner connection, the increase of values, cannot be comprehended at all. That is the pragmatical-reflecting, at once explaining and comprehending the purpose, i.e. psychological-motivating description, as it belongs to the tools and has not yet penetrated the deeper flow and signification. Things like that are indeed a scandal to the hypertrophy and [our fanatical need for] causality. But we easily understand, that the historian and philosopher of history in an atmosphere, still free from that, could breathe more easily and think greater. We shall also see that a similar separation of methods nolens volens returns in most of the philosophers.§§
When thus in the sequence the static isolation of completed and only afterwards combined processes has to make room for the flowing and the inner connection of things, the same is the case for the side-by-side and the simultaneousness. As modern mechanistic natural science and ethical-lawful-political individualism are connected with each other, thus dialectics is connected with the conception of mind as moving in masses, peoples and group-unities. Whatever impression the ... antique authors and the counterthrust against [the] French revolution of the Romantics made upon Hegel, in these questions he is in the first line not [an Aristotelian] or [a] philosopher of Restoration, but of dialectics and dynamics, which he naturally already was instinctively before he formed and founded the theory of dialectics.***

In interests and passions, fights and frictions, states and their jurisdiction form themselves, at first apparently as result of useful order and pacification. But that is only the form of the dialectical formation of the community and union of contrary wills. As community or nation or power, according to reason and uniformly comprehending itself in jurisdiction, reason in fact crystallizes itself from the apparently unreasonable. [The] State then is the dialectical unity of the contrasts of community and individual, the first self-order and condensation of reason, which therefore is the presupposition for all further development of the values of reason of religion, of art and of science. From the contrasts and fights of nations again crystallizes dialectically the unity, hidden and effective in them, of humanity, which can be thought only as synthesis of contrary and in that uniform individualities of peoples. General, absolute reason, also extending over the whole humanity, i.e. religion, art and philosophy, are therefore nationally colored, and only in the combination of their colors they form the pure light, never existing in reality because always split up, of absolute reason. Therefore Hegel can, in the sense of Germanic individualism and of the Christian idea of personality, increase and deepen the individual and yet at the same time melt it into the super-individual unity of the spirit and of the whole. Thus he can appear to the judges as liberal and as conservative; as to himself, these contrasts exist as little as those of mechanical and teleological. Because of this reason, state, with him, stands in the center of history, and the becoming of peoples and powers is the clue and the principle of periodization of history. This generally does go back to the practical central position of the state since the times of Absolutism and to the history since Voltaire and Montesquieu, and perhaps even to Hegel’s personal shocks by the dissolution of the German Empire. But Hegel from his dialectics gave a new significance and a new foundation to their idea.†††

While Comte in France from physics and biology created a ... sociology according to natural laws, the dialectic formed a theory, understood in its principles of unity from the inside, a collection of super-individual beings who, if they do not arise form the mutual effect of individuals, yet exist in it, differing only in how far they can lawfully formulate and express their super-individuality. Hegel would greet modern sociology, but consider it a preliminary work and supplementary science, which comprehends incidents form their external and causal side only, but would have to change with the final comprehension of its object, into dialectical-dynamical method, similarly as Ferdinand Tönnies actually turned biological sociology into the metaphysical and dialectical.†††
Here also Hegel has often been misunderstood, being called a mystical social-romantic.\textsuperscript{3} The mysticism of his total consciousness, however, is only the mysticism of his dialectics, which to him was the highest logical clearness, and the aristocratic height-description of his philosophy. His ... history observes ... mass-movements and accomplishments as the bases of summits, which only show clearly what dully fills the masses, in so far as there exists in them at all the strength of forceful ascent. That is the case with few peoples only, predestined to it already by particular accumulations of sympathetic and tending upwards, natural conditions. As with Ritter and Ratzel, the [whole movement] finally sinks into the natural development of our planet. Nature already is aristocratic, for it also proceeds dialectically, producing mind according to its dialectics. That mind on its side is also a substantial unity, linking together state, science, art and religion in a common fundamental being of the spirit of the nation as a unity developing and differentiating itself, is only the natural continuation of the natural-philosophical idea of correlative unity of life, and the un-avoidable point of dialectics....

\textsuperscript{3} Hegel’s anti-romanticism is well documented but he also represented a kind of rational romanticism in his own way, as did Marx. For Hegel, the human was not sunk in unknowing darkness (the Freudian unknowable subject is totally absent here) and submergence in nature is foreign to Hegel: nature was, as he put it in his lectures on the philosophy of religion, to be consumed by the fire of \textit{Geist} – an ongoing process of historical spiritualization.

ENDNOTES

* Cf. on this the description by Fueter “Geschichte der neueren Histoiographie,” 1911. Incidentally is Leibniz’ own historical work still completely under the influence of the older methods, especially of the Maurins; on himself his own doctrine had no effect, p. 316f; the parallels in Winckelmann and Hegel, p. 392. On Moeser’s “connection of individual and collective history,” also reminding of Hegel, p. 396. Moeser did come from the practical view; but it can hardly be explained by the fact, that he came form “social history” as a completely new theme; he also was already surrounded by the atmosphere of the idea of development, where the great significance of the unconscious has to be presupposed. Moeser’s historical thinking, anyway, homogenously flows into the whole movement of ideas, described here. On this cf. also Dilthey “18. Jahrbuch. u. gesch. Welt,” Deutsche Rundschau 1901, p. 363, who points to Leibniz.

† Cf. on this Dilthey “Die Jugendgeschichte Hegels,” 1905, now continued to Hegel’s later time in W. W. IV, 1921, and the excellent essay by H. Scholz “Hegel’s erstes System,” Preuss. Jahrh. Bd. 166; also the publications of writings for the young relating to theological history of religion and constitutional law by Nohl and Lasson; cf. also the almost too rich and therefore somewhat obscure book by Rosenzweig “Hegel un der Staat,” 1920.

‡ Cf. the subtle analysis by E. V. Hartmann “Die dialektische Methode,” 1868, especially on the thinking of intellect and of reason, pp. 51-66. Yet Hartmann believes this to be an eccentricity of Hegel’s; later in his doctrine of categories he appoints a conclusive place to this thinking of reason also.

§ That is the fundamental idea also in B. Croche “Lebendiges und Totes, in Hegel’s Philosophie,” German ed. 1909. On these motives of dialectics cf. also Lotze “Geschichte der Aesthetik in Deutschland,” p. 76ff.

** That is the fundamental logic of Hegel’s main work, the Phenomenology, the content of which is very well reproduced by R. W. Willcocks “Zur Erkenntnistheorie Hegels in der Phaenomenologie des Geistes,” 1917 (B. Erdmans Abh.z.Phil.51). The famous foreword contains the protest against Schelling’s conception of identity and its relation to the moved finite as “intellectual conception” or, as one would say today, as “intuition” or as “artistical [sic] view of the unity in the moved and manifold.” Hegel instead of that wants the logical deduction of the second from the first, by which should be attained also a logically necessary sequence in the movements and with this a secure direction towards the increase of values of manifestations alone. How important that is, shows the behavior of historicism founded on mere intuition. It dissolves the idea of design and its firm connection with the construction of becoming, lets it float uncertainly over the whole, urges into authority and church and makes on feel pessimistic. That will be shown in the next section. Purely aesthetical inclination, also, may follow from it, which easily leads into pessimism. The merely or predominantly artistical [sic] and intuitive conception of dynamics necessarily loses law and aim, unless the logical necessity and progress of dialectics is replaced by something else. We shall see that also in Bergson. Because of this connection of dialectic doctrine of motion with the self-movement of the divine all-spirit, which in this but logically comprehends its metaphysical essence and therefore is thinking itself, Lask, and following him, Max Weber call this logic “emanatistic,” thinking changing into reality and returning from there into itself. But that is only one side of the matter the chief thing is the conception of the logic of motion of dynamic itself.

†† Unfortunately it is impossible here to formulate more accurately the very interesting difference between these thinkers. Schleiermacher and Schelling are related the closest; they know only an increasing and progressing predominance of mind over nature, an oscillating, turning the scales first on the side of nature, then on that of mind, around the core of identity, but no inner law of motion, no logicizing [sic] of the ascent, no filling of identity with the idea of design; cf Süsskind “Der Einfluss Schellings auf die Entwicklung des Schleiermacherschen Systems,” 1909, and “Christentum und Geschichte bei Schleiermacher,” 1911, also Mehls “Schellings Geschichtephilosophie,” Heidelberg Diss. 1906. Fichte already has dialectics, but as infinite process without the original content and the original meaning of the single periods and moments, which leads into continual moralizing; cf. Lask “Fichtes Idealismus und die Geschichtephilosophie,” 1902. All these thinkers took the individual into
their systems, but could not mediate it with "development." W. von Humboldt explicitly puts dynamics into the center; his much discussed "ideas" are this dynamic only and nothing else, consciously viewed, however, intuitively and artistically, not rationalized by the introduction of the philosophy of identity and the dialectics produced by it. The "idea of humanity" is the law of development, the comprehension of all dynamics into the idea of human striving, but in fact only a very vague viewing together of the many individual possibilities of development. It is easy to understand that Hegel's conception of dynamics had the greater influence, appearing to solve the problems more connectedly, uniformly and more certain of his aim. To the historian of today, however, Humboldt's formulation will be the more agreeable one. It continues, in fact, Goethe's thinking into history, while Hegel scholastically rationalized it, to Goethe's annoyance. Cf. E. Spranger "Humboldt und die Humanistaetsidee," 1909, and Louis Ehrhardt, H. Z. 1855; on the relation between Goethe and Hegel is very instructive E. Cassirer "Freiheit und Form," 1916, p. 399. Cf. also Goethe's extremely characteristic statement about the two methods of knowledge of nature, the intuitive one ... and the mechanical-mathematical one...: Eckermann "Gespraeche II vom 12.2.1829," a statement which Spengler also hints at.

‡‡ Cf. Adolf Lasson, "Uber den Zufall 2," 1918 (Vortraege d. Kant-gesellschaft 18), also Lotze "Mikrikosmos 3 III" 32, who, however, sees in it the failure of the dialectical construction; similarly E. von Hartmann "Kategorienlehre," 1896, p. xi.

††† The same incidently is one of the fundamental ideas in Humboldt's treatise on the task of the historiographer, loc. cit., p. 35: "Those appearances (understood causally and according to natural laws) therefore account only for regular developments, returning according to recognized law or certain experience; but that which arises like a miracle and can be accompanied by mechanical, psychological and physiological explanations, but not really be deduced from any of them, that remains inside of that circle not only unexplained, but also unrecognized." The same is the reason for Goethe's investigation of nature, which Chamberlain instructively differentiates from science of nature.

*** That is shown [in] his youthful works, published by Nohl and Lasson, on theological and juridical-political subjects; in Dilthey's description also it is evident, that the dynamical conception everywhere is the first one. The rationalization by means of philosophy of identity is the systematic elaboration only.


+++ "Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft 2," 1912. Incidentally Tönnies stopped with affirmation and negation, sketching but timidly reaffirmation or synthesis. His optimism is somewhat broken by Schopenhauer's influence. J. Plenge, on the other hand, a sociologist and social economist, who also represents such a "sociology from the inside," completely and optimistically returns to Hegel and dialectics; cf. "Die Revolutionierung der Revolutionare," 1918, and "Die Geburt der Vernunft," 1918.