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Mottos

“Yes, the greater an upheaval (revolution) is to become the more profoundly it must plunge into its history.” * Heidegger

“Poetry is finer and more philosophical than history; for poetry expresses the universal, and history recants only the particulars.” ** Aristotle.

*[“Je größer eine Umwälzung sein muß, um so tiefer wird sie in ihrer Geschichte angreifen”]. Heidegger, Nietzsche: Der Wille zur Macht als Kunst. GA 43, page 252. Given as the Freiburger Vorlesung Wintersemester 1936/37].

**[Poetics (Peri poietikês, 1451b.5-7). 2300 years old. διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφῶτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον ποίησις ἱστορίας ἐστίν: ἢ μὲν γὰρ ποίησις μᾶλλον τὰ καθόλου, ἢ δ’ ἱστορία τὰ καθ’ ἐκαστὸν λέγει].
Preface and Introduction

This book’s goal is to give an intellectual context for the following manuscript. *The Oldest Systematic Program of German Idealism*. The German title is: *Das Älteste Systemprogramm Des Deutschen Idealismus*. This title was made up by Franz Rosenzweig in 1917, when he first published the manuscript. He found the manuscript in the Royal Library in Berlin in 1913. The manuscript suggested date is around 1796 and was done by handwriting research. However, the manuscript is not dated. The Prussian State Library auctioned in March 1913 from the auction of the house Liepmannssohn in Berlin a single sheet on the front and back with Hegel's cursive handwriting. The manuscript was lost during WWII. But Dieter Henrich found it again in 1979 in the “Biblioteka Jagiellonska” in Krakow (Poland), where it is today. Address: Jagiellonian Library, Jagiellonian University, al. Mickiewicza 22, 30-059 Cracow, Poland. Later research suggests that manuscript had come from the estate of Hegel’s student Friedrich Christoph Förster (1791-1868). He was one of the editors of Hegel’s posthumous works and most likely had access to a number of Hegel’s manuscripts. This text actually being one of them. Hegel traveled around Bohemia with Marie and Friedrich Christoph Förster around the year 1820-21 (see Klaus Vieweg).

In general, this 700-word text is not about Kant’s first *Critique* and any kind of foundationalism or methodology topics (the ‘metaphysics of metaphysics’ project). This text rather lines up with the issues and topics in the second stage of Kant’s mature philosophical development, namely, the *Critique of Practical Reason* (second Critique) 1788; and 1797’s *Metaphysics of Morals*; and *The Critique of Judgment* (third Critique) (first part, for example deals with the aesthetic reflective judgments) published in 1790. The expression “philosophy must become mythological” harkens to Schelling’s early interest in mythology. Another expression “Here I will descend into the fields of physics”, suggests Goethe and Hölderlin at this period in their development. Hegel was working on botany at this time. Note Schelling was also working on the natural sciences. Of course, there are many other possibilities. Read the text yourself (see below).
To the reader.

Take a plunge into the deep and cold waters. Maybe a quagmire or quandary, but decidedly interesting. This project is to contextualize an old handwritten manuscript which is about 225 years old. The actual author is a mystery. I offer my own assessment. You can make your own assessments. The mystery has continued to unfold since 1917. There is plenty to read.

Otherwise, think about the authorship and read more of the German philosophers and authors from this period and enjoy the depth of thinking and philosophizing. On one hand, there is just the sheer fun in the puzzle of the authorship questions; and on the other hand, these are the alluring thoughts that lead to the nascent stage of German Idealism and our intellectual heritage. There is no end to the accolades for this group of philosophers. A heritage that we still hear in in our attempts to move forward into our future.

Do your own astute exegesis (ἐξήγησις) as all paths are still open. Let your thought take to the wings of what is called thinking with this text. Critical encounters (Auseinandersetzung, or a Gegenüberstellung) with at least: Friedrich Hölderlin (1770-1843) Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775-1854), and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) --- starts here! German Idealism. We are not going to study this situation endlessly, instead we make some broad strokes and provide you a general context. You are allowed to read between the lines too. Goal: to understand the overall affinity and differences between the intellectuals of this period in German history; and to come to grips with this demanding text within its large scholarly context in the last 100 years. There are no final answers.

What if this text was “published” at the time? Would the author(s) have been considered incendiary? What was the motivation for writing this text? A call for a confrontation with leading intellectuals at the time? Slogans calling for action? A proclamation of a new generation of intellectuals? See the three controversies in Germany later discussed in the book. These controversies can be considered the “culture wars” of the times.

Background.
This text in German is 700 words (see Appendix A). I know of no other little text that has generated so much literature on the topic of the authorship. The following book traces the details of the debate from 1917 to 1989. See, Frank-Peter Hansen.
This book reviews hundreds of articles from different periods since 1917 in the discussion of this text. It is an extensive bibliography. Many of these articles and books show deep scholarship as well as stylistic flair and analytical tenacity. Join the paths in this mystery. There are many articles and book chapters in English as well.

Most scholars agree that the manuscript is handwritten by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) around the year 1796 in Bern, Switzerland. Note there is whole another discussion of how Hegel got the Memminger Paper that it was actually written on in Bern. The manuscript was written on Memminger Paper. Memmingen is a town in Swabia, Bavaria, Germany. Others date the manuscript to May 1796 based on letters and other of Hegel’s cursive manuscripts around this time. On the other hand, Frank-Peter Hansen suggests it dates to the spring 1795, in fact, May 1795. This is based on a physical examination of other Hegel cursive manuscripts from these months in 1795. This is partially based on an analysis of handwriting, paper, and ink of the early manuscripts that Hegel was working on around this time, entitled “Positivität des Christentums” and “Geist des Christentums”. It includes some comparisons of the color of the ink. But the text may have been written before a letter Hegel sent on 2 July 1797 to Nanette Endel (according to Annemarie und Reinhold Mayer).

There are Hegel’s handwriting examples, a letter to Captain von Steiger from July 1795, the poem Eleusis from August 1796 (no.58), two other letters to Nanette Endel (February and March 1797). Around this time, we also have, “Jedes Volk hat ihm eigene Gegen-stände der Phantasie . . . Sommer 1796] (Nohl 214-231): Die Positivität der christlichen Religion.” (According to Gisela Schüler).

The question of the size and type of margins comes into play with the question if Hegel was writing directly from his mind or in fact, he was just making a copy of another document. The other document that Hegel is copying could have been written by Hegel or combination of authors (creative joint project) or by a different author entirely. All of are open for paleographic analysis. There are other exemplars.

But some of the pro-Hegel authorship scholars suggest Frankfurt in early part of the year 1797. In fact, in 1797 January, Hegel starts the Hofmeister (live-in
teacher) position that Hölderlin found for him with the wine merchant Johann Noe Gogel (Am Roßmarkt, Rossmarkt, Frankfurt, Germany). Hegel may have fallen deeply in love about this time. See a fragment he wrote, called “Love” (Nohl, pp. 378-82) written in late 1797 or 1798.

An interesting aside: Hegel developed a taste for expensive wines and had to pay large bills the rest of life because of his taste for good wine. Later in 1801 January, Hegel moves on to Jena, Germany. A letter from Hegel to a wine merchant was recently sold at auction. [Autograph letter signed ('Hegel') to Gebrüder Ramann (wine-merchants in Erfurt), Jena, 12 October 1802, he was ordering, “Pontak, better known as 'teinturier du Cher’”]. However, Hegel was not an oenologist; he just liked drinking really good wine.

Note: If Hegel did in fact write this text during his time in Frankfurt (1797), then we must consider a whole group of intellectuals that Hegel was involved with. They are called the “Bund der Geister (Fraternity of Spirits) some named members: F. W. Jung, Siegfried Schmid, Johann Gottfried Ebel, Joseph Franz Molitor, Jakob Zwilling, Ph. J. Leutwein, Friedrich Muhrbeck, Friedrich Horn, and Casimir Böhlendorff.” (Manfred Frank). And of course, Hölderlin was in touch with Hegel (he lived nearby) and with the entire group of these intellectuals. This opens the doors to the possibility of many other unknown authors’ involvement in the ideas of this text.

Back to the mystery:

Who was the author?
Who were the authors?
Who was the intellectual author?

What is the general methodology of assigning authorship by scholars to this text? The scholars take a couple of key words and concepts and then find them in the writings or letters of the author they are claiming to be the actual author. Most discussion and scholarship centers around the author being one of these three: Friedrich Hölderlin (1770-1843, died age 73) Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775-1854, died age 79), or Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831, died age 61). When scholars are making their case, then they often leave out some words and ideas that do not fit in with that particular author. One example stands out, if Hegel is indeed the author this text, that does not line up with his other statements.
about the nature of the “state” from around this time.

Of course, that is just level 1, then the concepts and counter concepts of the authors and their involvements and ideas at the time. Plus, how each author went on to develop these concepts in their later published writings, or even their letters. This is especially true for Hegel and Schelling as they lectured and developed their philosophical theories over decades and they both published and were well known at the time. There are plenty of letters and documents to review. There was extensive circulation of their unauthorized lecture notes by students at the time. Some of these lecture notes were almost verbatim (underground printing piracy). So, there are a lot of later ideas and conceptual development of Hegel and Schelling in particular, to compare for analysis of this early text.

The later Schelling. Although Schelling is not a very eminent philosopher now, some of his students have become famous following him. Some of those attending Schelling’s University of Berlin lectures of 1841 included Kierkegaard, Engels, Bakunin, Ranke, Burkhardt, and Alexander von Humboldt. All of these intellectuals played an important role in the 1800s in Germany. Engels’ influence is shown especially via Karl Marx.

**Main books in the background.** Kant’s concept of “all practical postulates” and eternal peace (vom ewigen Frieden, perpetual peace). Kant published *Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf* in 1795 and a second edition right about the time of this text is being created in 1796. [AA 8: 343-86] and are actually mentioned in the text. The other book that is often mentioned in the context of the period is the book: *On the Aesthetic Education of Man in a Series of Letters (Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen)*, which is dated 1794 and was written by Johann Christoph Friedrich (von) Schiller (1759-1805) a close friend of Hölderlin at the time. But there are many more authors and ideas that are related to this text. Kant and Schiller are the starting point. Schiller may have been the author of this text.

**How to understand Kant?** At the time, Kant was being interpreted by Reinhold’s *Letters on the Kantian Philosophy* which came out in 1786 and 1787 in the journal *Der Teutsche Merkur*; and this was enlarged into a full book and published in 1790; and then again with a second volume in 1792. Reinhold was the focus of Schelling’s earliest writings around this time. A little bit later on, Reinhold was a
considered in a section of Hegel’s first major work; *The Difference Between Fichte’s and Schelling’s System of Philosophy*, ‘Differenzschrift’ of 1801.

**What is the genre of the text?**

I think this is where part of the understanding and difficulty comes in as to the real identity of our author. What are the general motifs? Topoi? What kind of rhetorical analysis is this text? Some of these statements sound like rhetorical questions. This is not a systematic philosophical essay. It is not a system of idealism. It is not in the form of a letter. This text is filled with “slogans” or “cavalier style” or “agitation” like statements. Some of them at the time would be considered “brash”. For example, “The people without aesthetic sense are our letter philosophers (Buchstabenphilosophen)” and “Only what is the object of freedom is called an idea. Therefore, we also have to go beyond the state!” The use of three exclamation points “!” in the text has to be carefully considered.

In my assessment and reading, this does not sound like any of these three authors. Although noted from some of his letters Schelling sometimes has this tone and use of slogans. The style does not fit their other published works. Of course, this has to do with my reading their later writings, and their style and genre of those writings. Plus, what was considered at the time the format of philosophical publications. However, I cannot claim to have exhaustively read all of their writings or even looked at the original manuscripts. Note in recent times, more of Hegel’s poems have surfaced, which has led to a re-reading of early Hegel cursive manuscripts from this period and his *Stammbuch*. One might become a graphologist or better yet, a paleographer for analysis of Hegel’s manuscripts.

But you are getting the general idea about the controversy about the identity of the author of this text. Who is the author? Is there more than one author? Who were those authors? Combinations of different authors?

One version and the one that is most likely. G.W.F. Hegel wrote this when he was the tutor of Karl Friedrich von Steiger’s (1754-1841) (he was called the “Dragonerhauptmann”) children (ages 6 and 8) for three years. Where was Hegel at the time? Answer: the location would be in the small town of Tschugg, it is a municipality in the Seeland administrative district in the canton of Bern in the nation of Switzerland. At the Steiger’s house was a very large library developed by his father. However, the library was not up to date with recent writers. The family library held 3,871 books, which Hegel made ample use of during the three
years while he lived in this house (see “Hegel in der Schweiz”). In the in-summer
time out into the country side of Bern, the actual house Hegel lived in is called the
“Steigerhaus” - it is still there as of 2021. The house and grounds were converted
to the Bethesda Clinic in 1889. Hegel was age 26 at the time he wrote this text. He
lived to the age of 61. Winter time was spent at Junkerngasse 51, Bern,
Switzerland (see photo later in this book). Also, the house is near the larger Bern
public library.

Was Hegel the author or the only author? Does the handwriting suggest he was in
fact “copying” the document from another document? Of course, what was the rest
of the document and text? We need a “science of sentences” (vākyaśāstra) to
figure this out. Could some of this just be solecism? What is ‘key’ to making sense
of the overall text? What are these thought-provoking concepts and where did they
lead German Idealism to in the future? Who else read this text besides Hegel?
Answer: most likely Friedrich Christoph Förster (1791-1868). Who else?
Discussion of the context and options.

Who is an author?
The intellectual author and creator of the ideas and putting the ideas into an actual language and on paper, or now, onto a computer. Who was the originator? Or maybe there is never an author just many different voices through one person, (See for example Roland Barthes (1915-1980) essay "Death of the Author" (1968). Or, another example, is Michel Foucault (1926-1984) in his essay "What is an author?" (1969). Understanding of the Joint Authorship or co-author(s).

These ideas were floating in the intellectual air of the time in the 1790s. Any of the well-read intellectuals of the time could have written this text? Or, was it just one gifted thinker?

1). Premise.
The overwhelming physical evidence is that Hegel wrote this handwritten cursive manuscript before 1800.

2). Hegel is most likely the author.

3). The burden of proof of a different author or authors of this text is decidedly on the side of the scholar trying to prove that Hegel is indeed, **not the author of the manuscript.**

4). However, since no author’s name is on the manuscript, than in all fairness the authorship is open for question and analysis. I am not trying to bulldoze. An amazing number of scholars have spent time analyzing this mystery in the last 100 years.

Who is the author or authors?
Options:

1). The simplest option is the “author” of this manuscript is Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) and the text is in his hand writing. H.S. Harris thinks it fits into the overall development of Hegel’s thought even though he thought the text was written in Frankfurt. But the article which was the most important article to claim the text was indeed written by Hegel is by Otto Pöggeler (1928 - 2014), Hegel, der Verfasser des ältesten Systemprogramms des deutschen Idealismus Hegel-Studien 4:17-32 (1969). Note the date of 1969. Or, was Hegel just a stenographer or someone else’s amanuensis? Questions about the format of the margins? Hegel’s other writings around this time have a different conceptual analysis of the “state”, which leads one away from Hegel, at least as the only single author.

Author? Likely.
Co-author? Likely.
Influence the author or authors? Yes.

Hegel was clearly against one of his teacher’s theological views, Gottlob Christian Storr (1746-1805) at this time. Storr believed in Biblical supranaturalism. N.B. F.W.J. Schelling wrote his 1795 thesis under Storr. The title is: De Marcione Paulinarum epistolarum emendatore (On Marcion as emendator of the Pauline letters). What were Hegel’s and Schelling’s radical theological views at the time? Note: Hölderlin’s theological views are seen as less important in this context.

Hegel’s letter to Schelling --- April 16, 1795.

“From the Kantian system and its highest completion, I expect a revolution in Germany. It will proceed from principles that are present and that only need to be elaborated generally and applied to all hitherto existing knowledge. An esoteric philosophy will, to be sure, always remain, and the idea of God as the Absolute Self will be part of it. After a more recent study of the postulates of practical reason I had a presentiment of what you clearly laid out for me in your last letter, of what I found in your writing, and of what Fichte's Foundation of the Science of Knowledge will disclose to me completely. The consequences that will result from
it will astonish many a gentleman. Heads will be reeling at this summit of all philosophy by which man is being so greatly exalted. Yet why have we been so late in recognizing man's capacity for freedom, placing him in the same rank with all spirits?"

2). Hegel wrote the manuscript after discussions with Friedrich Hölderlin (1770-1843) and Hegel was intended to send the text to Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775-1854) for his approval. Hegel looked up to Schelling at this time. One example of a theory to answer this mystery.

Joint authorship? Yes, likely.
Author? Not likely.
Co-author? Likely.
Influence the author or authors? Yes.

3). Hölderlin involvement. 1795. “On April 10, Schiller writes to Korner that Goethe now is a daily guest at his house; two weeks later Hölderlin reports to Neuffer: 'I still always drop by to see Schiller, where I now usually meet up with Goethe (Eckart Forster).” Hölderlin attended the lectures of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) as well and discussed Fichte in his letters to his friends. Fichte arrived at the University of Jena in May of 1794 and was forced to leave summer of 1799 (atheists attacks, flees to Berlin). In 1795, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) was involved in scientific work at this time. At the time of death, he had the largest collection of rocks in Europe amassing over 17,000 items. Goethe wrote about his approach to the scientific method in *The experiment as mediator between subject and object* (1772). About the time when Hölderlin was meeting up with Goethe, Foster states, “Goethe’s days in Jena were filled with a vast number of scientific activities: anatomic experiments, optical experiments, botanic observations, supervision of the Jena Botanische Anstalt, and so forth. At the same time, he works on a collection of his scientific writings under the title, *Beobachtungen und Betrachtungen aus der Naturlehre und Naturgeschichte*; on March 18, he corresponds with his publisher about what format the work should take (Eckart Forster)”.

The question about Goethe involvement in science and theory of color etc. all have been thrust aside since, he became a very famous fiction author of the novel *Sorrows of Young Werther* and the tragic play *Faust*.

Hölderlin was around when Johann Christoph Friedrich (von) Schiller (1759-1805) wrote a very famous book: *On the Aesthetic Education of Man in a Series of Letters* (*Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen*), 1794. All of the intellectuals of the day had read these. Hegel wrote about this book and the great impression this publication made on him in his personal letters at the time.

Another example of the three former roommates meeting during this time, “Furthermore, the young Schelling visited his friend Hölderlin in Frankfurt in the late Spring of 1796 after meeting the Illuminatus Johann Friedrich Mieg (1744–1811), who had recruited Abel in the early 1780s, and the Illuminatus Jacobin Georg Christian Gottfried Freiherr von Wedekind (1761–1831) in Heidelberg. (Laura Anna Macor)”. The text says, “Finally, the idea, all united, the idea of beauty, the word higher Platonic sense taken.” Hölderlin influence? From November 1794 to May-June 1795, Hölderlin stayed in Jena, Germany and attended Fichte’s lectures.

Author? Maybe.
Co-author? Certainly possible.
Influence the author or authors? Yes.


Background.
When he was 19 years old Schelling wrote his first philosophical work, *Über die Möglichkeit einer Form der Philosophie überhaupt* (1795; “On the Possibility and Form of Philosophy in General”), which he sent to Fichte, who expressed strong approval. It was followed by *Vom Ich als Prinzip der Philosophie* (“Of the Ego as Principle of Philosophy”). In the summer of 1795, Schelling completed theological studies and November took the final oral exam. So, then from 1795 to 1797 Schelling acted as a private tutor for a noble family, Baron von Riedesel in Stuttgart. He went with Riedesel’s two sons to the University of Leipzig to study law. This was an incredibly active period for Schelling’s publications and his
‘public” philosophical education via publications is a well-known adage about Schelling from the Hegel in 1820s.

_Ueber Mythen, historische Sagen und Philosopheme der ältesten Welt_ (On Myths, Historical Legends and Philosophical Themes of Earliest Antiquity, 1793).

_Ueber die Möglichkeit einer Form der Philosophie überhaupt_ (On the Possibility of an Absolute Form of Philosophy, 1794).

_Vom Ich als Prinzip der Philosophie oder über das Unbedingte im menschlichen Wissen_ (From the I as the Principle of Philosophy or on the Unconditional in Human Knowledge, 1795).

_Philosophische Briefe über Dogmatismus und Kriticismus_ (Philosophical Letters on Dogmatism and Criticism, 1795).

Thesis: _De Marcione Paulinarum epistolarum emendatore_ (1795), under Storr.

_Abhandlung zur Erläuterung des Idealismus der Wissenschaftslehre_ (1796).

Schelling wrote, “Neue Deduktion des Naturrechts” (‘New deduction of natural rights’), and published it in 1796 in _Philosophisches Journal_. Journal editors, were Fichte and Friedrich Niethammer (1766–1848). Niethammer 1784 became a student at Tübinger Stift were he meet many of intellectuals that are involved in our analysis. He was considered a close of friend of Hegel and wrote him a number of letters. For example, he got a Hegel a job later as the Rector and Professor of Philosophical Preparatory Sciences in Nuremberg.

Schelling’s other published book in the year 1797 was:


The problem is these Schelling writings do not sound like the _Das älteste Systemprogramm des deutschen Idealismus_. Schelling was very busy writing his other publications. These were involved with Fichte’s philosophy and trying to move beyond Fichte. However, Schelling was developing his own philosophy at the time and it is more complex. Yes, note Schelling and Hölderlin had known
each other since, their Latin School days of 1776. Schelling and Hölderlin
meetings are suggestive: July/August, 1795, December 1795 in Tübingen; and then
during April 1796 in Frankfurt.

You can get some sense of Schelling’s enthusiasm about the times and his
understanding of Kant, Fichte, and the crowds.

Schelling’s letter to Hegel dated January 5, 1795.

“Who wants to bury himself in the dust of antiquity when the movement of his own
time at every turn sweeps him up and carries him onward? I live and move at
present in philosophy. Philosophy is not yet at an end. Kant has provided the
results. The premises are still missing. And who can understand results without
premises? Perhaps a Kant, but what is the great crowd to make of it? Fichte, the
last time he was here, said that one must have the genius of a Socrates to fathom
Kant. I find this truer every day. We must continue still further with philosophy.
Kant has swept everything away, but how is the crowd to notice? One must smash
it to pieces before their very eyes, so they grasp it in their hands. The great
Kantians now everywhere to be seen have got stuck on the letter, and bless
themselves on seeing still so much before them. I am definitely convinced that the
old superstition of so-called natural religion as well as of positive religion has in
the minds of most already once more been combined with the Kantian letter. It is
fun to see how quickly they can get to the moral proof. Before you can turn around
the deus ex machina springs forth, the personal individual Being who sits in
Heaven above! Fichte will raise philosophy to a height at which even most of the
hitherto Kantians will become giddy .... I am now receiving the beginning of the
detailed exposition from Fichte himself, the Foundation of the Entire Science of
Knowledge. ... I read it and found my prophecies had not been proven false. Now I
am working on an ethic à la Spinoza. It is designed to establish the highest
principles of all philosophy, in which theoretical and practical reason are united…”


When you read this letter, it sounds like Schelling was already “giddy” himself.

Recent comments.
In a letter to Otto Pöggeler, Heidegger (1965) confessed,
"I was never satisfied with the view that the text was by Schelling, the written copy
by Hegel. But I didn't know where to turn".

Author? Not likely.
Co-author? Maybe.
Influence the author or authors? Yes.
However, I note Schelling seems to have the gift of writing “slogans”. See his letters.

5). Others involved in the discussion and/or an ‘author’. October 1788, Hölderlin started school at the Tübingen Stift, his roommates were Hegel and Schelling. Their fellow student was Isaac von Sinclair (1775-1815), he also attended the lectures of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) and Fichte’s enemy, C. C. E. Schmid. He says in the letter about the both of them:

“Their cold proofs, their Raisonnement which springs forth from the depths of reason and spreads itself out to all the branches of human actions, will vindicate the rights of humanity and overthrow all thrones (Letter to Prinzenerzieher in Homburg, Heinrich Brühl, from June 6, 1794)” (Manfred Frank).

We can conclude that Isaac von Sinclair could indeed write “slogans”.

Note of the three roommates, Hölderlin was the closest to Sinclair. Sinclair published poems, a tragedy, and some philosophical works later, for example, Truth and certainty. 3 vols., Frankfurt a. M. 1811-13. Attempt at a physics based on metaphysics. Frankfurt a. M. 1813. See for example, the book Isaak von Sinclair zwischen Fichte, Hölderlin und Hegel by Hannelore Hegel, Klostermann, Vittorio, 1971. However, I note that Hegel’s letters to Isaac von Sinclair date after 1805. Did he write Älteste Systemprogramm?

Author? Not likely.
Co-author? Maybe.
Influence the author or authors? Yes, to some extent.
Could Isaac von Sinclair could have written the text to Hölderlin; and then Hegel was making a copy for himself? And then afterwards Hegel gave the original back to Hölderlin?


Author? Not likely.
Co-author? Not likely.
Influence the author or authors? Yes, to some extent.

7). Martin Oesch. „„Das Älteste Systemprogramm Des Deutschen Idealismus”: Ein Fragment Friedrich Schlegels. Suggestion of Karl Wilhelm Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) as the author. Maybe with the help of Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis) (1772-1801, died at the age of 28). In 1797, Novalis and Schelling went on an art tour of Dresden together. See for example, Stoljar, Margaret Mahoney, ed. (1997), the *Novalis: Philosophical Writings*. He was part of the group of young intellectuals at the time all working on similar ideas and reacting to the many publications at the time. However, he “closed the philosophical shop” (letter to Goethe of December 17, 1795) and returned to fiction. Also note that Karl Wilhelm Friedrich Schlegel was still attending Fichte’s lectures 1796-1801. So, he was still deep into the trenches of philosophy even though he stopped writing his own philosophical essays. Did he write *Älteste Systemprogramm*?

8). Johann Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853).
Published: *Volksmärchen von Peter Lebrecht* (3 vols., 1797). He was known for bringing the humor to the party of the group called the Jena Romanticism. Schlegel brothers and Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis); and Schelling on the philosophical side. Did he write *Älteste Systemprogramm*?

This was of course, all within the context of Kant’s publications and ideas. Kant’s ideas totally dominated this time in German intellectual history – but often times critical of Kant’s attempts for metaphysics. Hegel was less enamored with Kant’s
theoretical philosophy than Schelling or Hölderlin in the early 1790s. Hölderlin was hearing the lectures and talking with Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) in person, and Schelling was writing about Fichte’s philosophy and exchanging letters with Fichte. See for example, the book, *Philosophical Rupture between Fichte and Schelling: Selected Texts and Correspondence (1800-1802).*

Author? Not likely.
Co-author? Not likely.
Influence the author or authors? Yes, to some extent.

9). The expression “Monotheism of reason [German text page 235] and of the heart, polytheism of imagination and of art, this is what we need!” is similar to a remark that Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) published a few years later.

Author? Not likely.
Co-author? Not likely.
Influence the author or authors? Yes, to some extent.
The Oldest Systematic Program of German Idealism

“Das Alteste Systemprogramm Des Deutschen Idealismus”

- **an ethics**. Since the whole of metaphysics henceforth falls into **morality** - of which Kant, with his two practical postulates, has given only an **example**, has exhausted nothing - this ethics will be nothing but a complete system of all ideas, or, what is the same thing, of all practical postulates. The first idea is, of course, the idea of **myself** as an absolutely free being (Wesen). With the free, self-conscious being (Wesen) there emerges at the same time a whole world - out of nothing - the only true and conceivable **creation out of nothing**. - Here I shall descend to the fields of physics; the question is this: what must a world be like for a moral being (Wesen)? For once I would like to give wings again to our slow physics, which is tediously striding along on experiments.

Thus, if philosophy gives the ideas, and experience (Erfahrung) the data, we may at last get the physics on a large scale which I expect from later ages. It does not seem that the present physics can satisfy a creative spirit such as ours is or should be.

From nature I come to the **work of man**. I will show that there is no idea of the state, because the state is something mechanical, just as little as there is an idea of a machine. Only that which is the object of **freedom** is called an **idea**. We must therefore also go beyond the state! - For every state must treat free men as [German text page 234] mechanical gear mechanism (Räderwerk); and this it should not to do; therefore, it should **stop**. You see of your own accord that here all the ideas, from eternal peace, etc., are only subordinate ideas of a higher idea: at the same time, I want to lay down here the principles for a history of mankind, and to bare to the skin the whole wretched human work of state, constitution, government, legislation. Finally, come the ideas of a moral world, deity, immortality, - subversion (Umsturz) after faith (Afterglaubens), persecution of the priesthood, which lately feigns reason, through reason itself. - Absolute freedom of
all spirits, who carry the intellectual world within themselves and must seek neither God nor immortality apart from oneself.

Lastly, the idea which unites all, the idea of beauty, the word taken in a higher Platonic sense. I am now convinced that the highest act of reason, which, embracing all ideas, is an aesthetic act, and that truth and goodness are only conjoined in beauty. The philosopher must possess as much aesthetic power as the poet. Men without an aesthetic sense are our philosophers of letters (Buchstabenphilosophen). The philosophy of spirit is an aesthetic philosophy. One cannot be witty in anything; one cannot even reason wittily about history - without an aesthetic sense. Here it shall be revealed what is actually lacking in people who do not understand ideas - and confess faithfully enough that everything is obscure to them as soon as it goes beyond tables and registers.

Poetry (Die Poesie) thus acquires a higher dignity, it becomes again in the end what it was in the beginning - teacher of mankind; for there is no more philosophy, no more history, poetry alone will outlive all other sciences and arts.

At the same time, we hear so often that the great multitude must have a sensual religion. Not only the great multitude, also the philosopher needs it. Monotheism of reason [German text page 235] and of the heart, polytheism of imagination and of art, this is what we need!

First of all, I shall speak here of an idea which, as far as I know, has not yet come to mind - we must have a new mythology, but this mythology must be in the service of ideas, it must become a mythology of reason.

Before we make ideas aesthetic, that is, mythological, it has no interest for the people (Volks); and conversely, before mythology is sensible, the philosopher must be ashamed of it. Thus, at last the enlightened and the unenlightened (Unaufgeklärte) must join hands; mythology must become philosophical and the people reasonable, and philosophy must become mythological in order to make the philosophers sensuous. Then there is eternal unity among us. Never the contemptuous look, never the blind trembling of the people (Volks) before their sages and priests.

Only then will same development of all forces, of the individual as well as of all individuals. No forces will be oppressed any more. Then there will be general freedom and equality of spirits! - A higher spirit, sent from heaven, must found this new religion among us; it will be the last, greatest work of mankind. [German text
page 236].

[Dann herrscht allgemeine Freiheit und Gleichheit der Geister! – Ein höherer Geist, vom Himmel gesandt, muß diese neue Religion unter uns stiften, sie wird das letzte, größte Werk der Menschheit sein [page 236 in German].
End of Text.
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“The Oldest Systematic Program of German Idealism”
“Das älteste Systemprogramm des deutschen Idealismus”
Or, The “Das Alteste Systemprogramm Des Deutschen Idealismus”
Note this title made up by Franz Rosenzweig when it first published in print in 1917. In the manuscript there is no title or date. Alternative title is “eine Ethik” which are the first two word on the first page.

Discussion of the manuscript details and authorship:

G. W. F. Hegel [Schreiber]: eine Ethik., ehem. Preußische Staatsbibliothek, acc.ms1913.12/Biblioteka Jagiellonska Krakow, jetzt Staatsbibliothek Berlin PK, [VorlageFaksimile in: Jamme/Schneider: Mythologie der Vernunft (Hg.), Frankfurt 1984; jetztüberprüft am Scan der Jagiellonian Digital Library, Transkr. Christoph v. Wolzogen]. Note: Handwriting and document analysis, etc. Analysis was done with color version of the scanned manuscript.


(Hegel hatte am 30. August 1795 an Schelling geschrieben: Hölderlin, höreich, sei in Tübingen gewesen; gewiß habt Ihr immer angenehme Stunden miteinander zugebracht; wie sehr wünschte ich, der dritte Mann dazu gewesen zu sein!).

Select Books:


Rüdiger Bubner. *Das älteste Systemprogramm: Studien zur Frühgeschichte des deutschen Idealismus* (Hegel-Studien, Beihefte 9) (German Edition) [Print Replica]


Select Articles:


Oesch, Martin. „„Das Älteste Systemprogramm Des Deutschen Idealismus“: Ein Fragment Friedrich Schlegels?” *Perspektiven Der Philosophie*, vol. 21, no. n/a, Rodopi, 1995, pp. 293–313.

---. „„Das Älteste Systemprogramm Des Deutschen Idealismus“: Ein Fragment Friedrich Schlegels?” *Perspektiven Der Philosophie*, vol. 21, Rodopi, 1995, pp. 293–313. “54. One can only become a philosopher, not be one. As soon as one thinks one is a philosopher, one stops becoming one.” Friedrich Schlegel.


Memminger Papier.
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**ZUR CHRONOLOGIE VON HEGELS JUGENDSCHRIFTEN**

GISELA SCHÜLER Hegel-Studien Vol. 2 (1963), pp. 111-159 (49 pages) Published By: Felix Meiner Verlag GmbH.
Johann Christian Friedrich Hölderlin (1770-1843):


Appendix German text from Hegel’s writings.

Das älteste Systemprogramm des deutschen Idealismus.

This title was made up by Rosenzweig, Franz. Das Älteste Systemprogramm Des Deutschen Idealismus, Ein Handschriftlicher [a Fragment of G.W.F. Hegel]. 1917. Sometime the title is just the first two word: eine Ethik.

Note: the manuscript is in the hand writing of G.W.F. Hegel, but the actual authorship is disputed. No date is given. There are copies of this text in the collective published writings of Hegel, Schelling, and Hölderlin; hence, all editor’s claiming to be the the actual “author“ of the text. Page numbers here are from Hegel’s published writings.

Text:


So, wenn die Philosophie die Ideen, die Erfahrung die Data angibt, können wir endlich die Physik im Großen bekommen, die ich von späteren Zeitaltern erwarte. Es scheint nicht, daß die jetzige Physik einen schöpferischen Geist, wie der unsrige ist oder sein soll, befriedigen könne.

was Gegenstand der Freiheit ist, heißt Idee. Wir müssen also auch über den Staat hinaus! – Denn jeder Staat muß freie Menschen als [234] mechanisches Räderwerk behandeln; und das soll er nicht; also soll er aufhören. Ihr seht von selbst, daß hier alle die Ideen, vom ewigen Frieden u.s.w. nur untergeordnete Ideen einer höheren Idee sind: Zugleich will ich hier die Prinzipien für eine Geschichte der Menschheit niedergehen und das ganze elende Menschenwerk von Staat, Verfassung, Regierung, Gesetzgebung bis auf die Haut entblößen. Endlich kommen die Ideen von einer moralischen Welt, Gottheit, Unsterblichkeit, – Umsturz alles Afterglaubens, Verfolgung des Priestertums, das neuerdings Vernunft heuchtelt, durch die Vernunft selbst. – Absolute Freiheit aller Geister, die die intellektuelle Welt in sich tragen und weder Gott noch Unsterblichkeit außer sich suchen dürfen.


Die Poesie bekommt dadurch eine höhere Würde, sie wird am Ende wieder, was sie am Anfang war – Lehrerin der Menschheit; denn es gibt keine Philosophie, keine Geschichte mehr, die Dichtkunst allein wird alle übrigen Wissenschaften und Künste überleben.

Zu gleicher Zeit hören wir so oft, der große Haufen müsse eine sinnliche Religion haben. Nicht nur der große Haufen, auch der Philosoph bedarf ihrer. Monotheismus der Vernunft [235] und des Herzens, Polytheismus der Einbildungskraft und der Kunst, dies ist's, was wir bedürfen!

Zuerst werde ich hier von einer Idee sprechen, die, soviel ich weiß, noch in keines Menschen Sinn gekommen ist – wir müssen eine neue Mythologie haben, diese Mythologie aber muß im Dienste der Ideen stehen, sie muß eine Mythologie der Vernunft werden.
Ehe wir die Ideen ästhetisch, d. h. mythologisch machen, haben sie für das Volk kein Interesse; und umgekehrt, ehe die Mythologie vernünftig ist, muß sich der Philosoph ihrer schämen. So müssen endlich Aufgeklärte und Unaufgeklärte sich die Hand reichen, die Mythologie muß philosophisch werden und das Volk vernünftig, und die Philosophie muß mythologisch werden, um die Philosophen sinnlich zu machen. Dann herrscht ewige Einheit unter uns. Nimmer der verachtende Blick, nimmer das blinde Zittern des Volks vor seinen Weisen und Priestern. Dann erst erwartet uns gleiche Ausbildung aller Kräfte, des Einzelnen sowohl als aller Individuen. Keine Kraft wird mehr unterdrückt werden. Dann herrscht allgemeine Freiheit und Gleichheit der Geister! – Ein höherer Geist, vom Himmel gesandt, muß diese neue Religion unter uns stiften, sie wird das letzte, größte Werk der Menschheit sein.[236].

Citations:

See also: Friedrich Hölderlin: Sämtliche Werke. 6 Bände, Band 4, Stuttgart 1962, pages, 228-229, 309-312.
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The three Controversies in Germany: Lessing’s Fragments Controversy, Pantheism Controversy (Pantheismusstreit), and the later Atheism disputes. 1774-1812.

Section 1). Pantheism Controversy (Quarrel) (Pantheismusstreit)

Kant’s philosophy and theology is entangled in the following positions both for and against. Indeed, other lesser-known philosophers are in-between Kant and these different philosophical positions. For example, Johann Georg Sulzer (1720-1779) (Wolfian and translator of Hume An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals into German in 1755), Johann August Eberhard, (a Wolfian, 1739-1809), and Johann Georg Heinrich Feder (1740-1821). Johann Hamann wrote to Johann Herder in 1779, that Kant always had books of Johann Nikolaus Tetens, (1736-1807) open on his desk (he was a well-known German follower of Hume). These are just to give you some basic ‘signs’ on the way to building a comprehensive view of Kant and his philosophy as it developed in the context of these philosophers. In other words, the interweaving and currents of the intellectual period of 1785-1790s is in reality a lot more complex than just these simple –isms; but these can be used as some guideposts as you make your own way. Nevertheless, you must get beyond mere philosophical labels, as I think F.W.J. Schelling is the one philosopher who understood this insight best when he wrote:

“It cannot be denied that it is a splendid invention to be able to designate entire points of view at once with such general epithets. If one has once discovered the right label for a system, everything else follows of its own accord and one is spared the trouble of investigating its essential characteristics in greater detail.
Even an ignorant person can render judgment upon the most carefully thought-out ideas as soon as they are presented to him with the help of such labels. But, after all, in an extraordinary assertion of this kind, everything depends upon the closer definition of the concept.” (From Martin Heidegger’s *Philosophical Investigations into the Essence of Human Freedom*, 1809, translation by Joan Stambaugh).

**Kant’s philosophical thinking was against these movements.**

Against the Sturm und Drang (Storm and Urge (stress) movement (especially, Kant’s former student – Johann Herder and also Kant’s friend Johann Hamann)  
Against Pantheism (Lessing, Spinoza)  
Against Skepticism (Hume)  
Against Rationalism (Leibniz’s version)  
Against Faith (Glaube, the German word for: “faith” or "belief"), revelation and mysticism (Jacobi)  
Against fanaticism or enthusianism (Schwärmerei)  
Against Common sense (Mendelssohn’s version)  
Against rational metaphysics  
Against Dogmatism (Wolff, at least the Kantian version of Wolffian dogmatism)  
Against rational metaphysics (attacked by Kant in 1st *Critique of Pure Reason*)  
Against Spinoza (atheism, nihilism (word first used by Jacobi), fatalism, no personal God)  
Deism vs. Theism  
Against the Spinoza’s nonanthropocentrism  
Against Systems as such (in Spinoza’s and Descartes’s view)  
Against freedom (Spinoza’s denial of free will)  
Against some version of Johann Hamann’s countering Rationalism with Awakening (Enweckung)  

Contra, plus side: Immanuel Kant used the expression "rational faith" (Vernunftglaube).

**Chronology of the Pantheism Controversy (Quarrel) (Pantheismusstreit)**

**Section 1-A. Main philosophers and authors. Ranked by birth year.**

René Descartes (1596-1650)  
Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677)
John Locke (1632-1704)
Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz (1646-1716)
Christian Wolff (1679-1754)
Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768)
-------- Daughter, Elise Reimarus (1735-1805)
Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1714–1762)
Johann Melchior Goeze (1717-1786)
Johann Wilhelm Ludwig Gleim (1719-1803)
Immanuel Kant (1724-1804)
Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781)
Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786)
Johann Georg Hamann (1730-1788)
Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi (1743-1819)
Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803)
Markus Herz or Marcus Herz (1747-1803)
Johann Erich Biester (1749-1816)
Salomon Maimon (1753–1800) [Salomon ben Josua Maimon]
Karl Leonhard Reinhold (1757-1823)
Thomas Wizenmann (1759-1787)
Jakob Sigismund Beck (1761-1840)
Gottlob Ernst Schulze "Aenesidemus" (1761-1833)
Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814)
Friedrich Immanuel Niethammer (1766-1848)
August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767-1845)
Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768-1834)
Johann Christian Friedrich Hölderlin (1770-1843)
Friedrich Karl Forberg (1770-1848)
Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831)
Karl Wilhelm Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829)
Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775-1854)
Section 2. Lessing’s first quarrel. Fragments Controversy.

Fragments Controversy (Fragmentenstreit)


1775. *Philosophical Conversations*. By Mendelssohn


1779. *Nathan the Wise* (*Nathan der Weise*). This is a play by Lessing, written in winter of 1778-1779. Note: this play takes place during the historical Third Crusade in Jerusalem in the year 1192.
Section 3. Pantheism Controversy or Pantheism Quarrel starts. (Pantheismusstreit).

1780. July 5-6th in Wolfenbüttel, which is a town in Lower Saxony, Germany, located on the Oker River. Jacobi meets and held discussions with Lessing (who was the librarian at the Wolfenbüttel library [Duke of Brunswick’s Herzog-August-Bibliothek]. Lessing makes two unforgettable remarks that really stings Jacobi. The first remark is about theology and his expression was “One and All” (Greek is “hen kai pan” [Ἑν καὶ Πᾶν]); this means pantheism. Second remark is that Lessing said, “There is no philosophy other than Spinoza”. This is the starting point and core of the whole Pantheism Controversy. What does this mean for philosophy? Many philosophers in Germany at the time considered Spinoza to be an atheist. Following an atheist was very controversial at the time.

Lessing died in February 15, 1781 at age 52.

1781. Critique of Pure Reason (Kritik der reinen Vernunft) (1st edition or the so-called A-edition). By Kant. (AK 4:1-252). Kant’s own personal marginalia is recorded at AK 23:17-50. Bound copy of the famous book arrives for Kant’s breakfast July 22, 1781. Kant was living in apartment on Ochsenmarkte, Königsberg, which was the capital of the Kingdom of Prussia at that time. Now the city is called Kaliningrad and it is in the Russian Federation. Sometimes called “City of Koenigsberg”. This book is called the first Critique (two more Critiques were written).

1783. Draft for the Prolegomena. Vorarbeit zu den Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik (AK 23:51-65). By Kant. These are part of Kant’s notes against the Garve (written) and Feder (edited) after their review was published 19 January 1782 of the Critique of Pure Reason. The first shorten review was published in the Zugabe zu den Göttischen Anzeigen von Gelehrten Sachen (Göttingen Learned Advertiser) and was published anonymously; and the original and longer version published in the Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek (General German Library) [Volumes XXVII-LII, part II, pages 838-62]. See Garve’s letter to Kant of 13 July 1783.

1783. Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics that will be able to come forward as a Science (Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysic, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können). By Kant. (AK 4:253-383).
1783. Kant moves into his own house 87-88 Prinzessinstraße, Königsberg, which was the capital of the Kingdom of Prussia at that time. Now the city is called Kaliningrad and it is in the Russian Federation.

1785. September. *On the doctrine of Spinoza in Letters to Moses Mendelssohn* (Über die Lehre des Spinoza in Briefen an den Herrn Moses Mendelssohn). By Jacobi. This was about Lessing being a follower of Spinoza and a follow up to their discussions of 1780.

1785. October 16. Letter to Kant from Moses Mendelssohn. “Though I no longer have the strength to study your profound writings with the necessary concentration, I recognize that our basic principles do not coincide. But I know too that you tolerate disagreement, indeed that you prefer it to blind worship. From what I know of you, the intention of your Critique is just to drive blind worship out of philosophy. Apart from that, you permit everyone to have and to express opinions that differ from your own.” Later in the letter: “All in all this work of Herr Jacobi is an unusual mixture, an almost monstrous birth, with the head of Goethe, the body of Spinoza, and the feet of Lavater.” [AK 10:413-414].

1785. October. *Morning hours or lectures about God's existence. (Morgenstunden oder Vorlesungen über das Dasein Gottes)*. By Mendelssohn.

1785. October-December. Mendelssohn is writing the book *To Lessing's Friends*.

1786. *To Lessing's Friends (An die Freunde Lessings)*. By Mendelssohn (published posthumously). He took this manuscript to his publisher Voss and Sohn, and in the process forgot his overcoat on December 31, 1785; and he caught a cold and died. The popular newspaper account was that Jacobi had caused Mendelssohn death. Mendelssohn died January 4, 1786 in Berlin.


1786. 7 April. Kant’s letter to Marcus Herz. (AK 10:442-443). Signed: most obedient faithful servant, I. Kant. Kant writes, “The Jacobi controversy is nothing serious; it is only an affection of inspired fanaticism? trying to make a name for itself and is hardly worthy of a serious refutation. It is possible that I shall publish something in the *Berliner Monatsschrift* to expose this humbug (Gaukelwerk or deception).”
1786. 11 June. Johann Erich Biester’s (one of Kant’s friends and editor, 1749-1834) wrote a letter to Kant. (AK 10:453-458). This letter finally provoked Kant to get involved in the Pantheism Controversy. Kant was not in agreement with Jacobi; and Kant had to make a public statement on this essential point. This lead Kant immediately to write and publish the essay: *What does it mean to orient oneself in thinking?* And against any link of Kant’s philosophy with Spinoza (mentioned by name in this letter).

1786. 11 June. Biester’s letter to Kant. “Only you, dearest, most excellent man, I implore you to throw your healing Stone of Minerva on the raving fanatics; reject your initial plan and at least tell the public explicitly and immediately that Herr J. has misunderstood you and that you can never be an ally of the Christian Society for the Advancement of Atheism and Fanaticism.” [AK 10:456] “But everyone must be pained by the damage to the good cause and to the person if it can be made to appear that the greatest philosopher of our country and philosophy in general can be accused of supporting dogmatic atheism. This loathsome accusation might then make an impression, an impression which would however be totally weakened if you had previously declared your distance from any connection with this fanatic atheism.” [AK 10:457]. This letter must have provoked and disturbed Kant from his slumber.


1786. August. Died: Friedrich II was King in Prussia (1740–1786) of the Hohenzollern dynasty. Next was Frederick William II was King of Prussia from 1786 until 1797, then Friedrich William III was King of Prussia from 1797 to 1840.

1786-1787. August. *Letters on the Kantian Philosophy (Briefe über die Kantische Philosophie).* By Karl Leonhard Reinhold. Last installment published in September 1787. These published letters made Kant famous during his lifetime. Reinhold re-wrote Kant as doing theology, and hence begun the marketing of Kant’s philosophy as theology.

1786. October. *What does it mean to orient oneself in thinking?* (Was heißt: sich im Denken orientieren?). By Kant. (AK 8:131-147).


1787. *David Hume on Faith, or Idealism and Realism* (David Hume Über den Glauben, oder Idealismus und Realismus). By Jacobi.


1789. 30 August. Kant’s letter to Jacobi. “I have always thought it my duty to show respect for men of talent, science, and justice, no matter how far our opinions may differ. You will, I hope, appraise my essay on orientation, in the *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, from this perspective. I was requested by various people to cleanse myself of the suspicion of Spinozism, and therefore, contrary to my inclination, I wrote this essay. I hope you will find in it no trace of deviation from the principle I have just affirmed. With inner pain I have read some other attacks upon your views and those of some of your worthy friends, and I have even spoken out against such attacks.” [AK 11:76-77].

1789. 16 November. Letter from Jacobi to Kant. “As you are my teacher! As you are a man whom I already admired with a pounding heart when I was young and before whom I would now bow with veneration as before a great conqueror and wise lawgiver in the realm of science, were I to say this of you publicly at a time and in circumstances in which no shadow of suspicion could be aroused that I was guilty of self-serving flattery. You yourself, most esteemed Kant, mention your
essay "On Orientation," that appeared in the *Berliner Monatsschrift*; and you mention it in such a way as not only to silence any complaint from my lips but to erase completely and forever even the faintest grievance that might yet be stirred up in my heart. None of your admirers can exceed me in the reverence and affection which I feel for you.” [AK 11:102].


1791. Johann Christian Friedrich Hölderlin (1770-1843) writes in his roommate and friend’s yearbook, that is, in Hegel yearbook of 1791 we find an inscription in Greek the words are: “S. Ἐν καὶ Πᾶς” or “S. hen kai pan”, “One and All”. The capital letter “S” is abbreviation for the word *Symbolum* (Latin word for symbol). This Greek expression was used by Lessing, and as such was noted by Jacobi. Considered the overall motto for Pantheism.


1794. *Spinozism and Brief Presentation of the Spinozistic System* (*Spinozismus und Kurze Darstellung des Spinozistischen Systems*). By Schleiermacher.

1795. 6 January. Schelling’s letter to Hegel. “Now I am working on an *Ethics à la* Spinoza – it shall establish the highest principles of all philosophy, the principles in which the theoretical and practical are united…”


1795. 4 February. Schelling’s letter to Hegel. “I have in the interim become a Spinozist!”

1795. 2 July. Fichte’s letter to Reinhold about Schelling. “I am most pleased by his inclination towards Spinoza by whose system my system can best be explained.”
1795. *Metaphysics of Morals (Die Metaphysik der Sitten in zwei Teilen).* By Kant.

1796. 23 July. Kant retires from lecturing in the middle of the semester (some reports suggest that Kant had stopped lecturing as early as 1793).

1796? *Das älteste Systemprogramm des deutschen Idealismus.* Note: the manuscript is in the hand writing of G.W.F. Hegel, but the actual authorship is disputed. There is no date on the manuscript. Hand writing analysis suggests at date around May 1796, but under debate.

1797. *Hyperion or The Hermit in Greece (Hyperion oder Der Eremit in Griechenland).* Volume 1 in 1797, Volume 2 in 1799. By Hölderlin.

“To be one with all—this is the life divine, this is man's heaven.
To be one with all that lives, to return in blessed self-forgetfulness into the All of Nature—this is the pinnacle of thoughts and joys, this the sacred mountain peak, the place of eternal rest, where the noonday loses its oppressive heat and the thunder its voice and the boiling sea is as the heaving field of grain.”
Atheism dispute (Atheismusstreit) starts.

1798 to 1799. Atheism dispute (Atheismusstreit). Friedrich Karl Forberg and Fichte. In 1799, Fichte is dismissed from University of Jena, April 1, 1799.


1798. Autumn. Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834) and William Wordsworth (1850) travel to Germany. Wordsworth lived for a while in Goslar, Germany.

1798. 18 December. “Saxon requisition letter to the Weimar court” by Frederick Augustus I of Saxony; and “Weimar rescript the University of Jena” by Karl August, Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach.

1799. 9 January. Appeal to the Public: A writing one is requested to read before confiscating (Appellation an das Publikum). By Fichte.


1799. Open Letter to Fichte (Sendschreiben an Fichte). By Jacobi. Used the term nihilism (maybe first usage).

1799. 1 April. Fichte is dismissed from University of Jena. Flees to Berlin.


Kant says at the end, “Nevertheless the critical philosophy must remain confident of its irresistible propensity to satisfy the theoretical as well as the moral, practical purposes of reason, confident that no change of opinions, no touching up or reconstruction into some other form, is in store for it; the system of the Critique rests on a fully secured foundation, established forever; it will prove to be
indispensable too for the noblest ends of mankind in all future ages.”
[AK 12: 371].

1799. 6 April. Letter from Reinhold to Fichte.

1799. 5 July. Fichte questioned by police in Berlin.


1801. The Difference Between Fichte’s and Schelling’s System of Philosophy, ‘Differenzschrift”. Differenz des Fichteschen und Schellingschen Systems der Philosophie. By Hegel


1804. 12 February. Immanuel Kant dies at the age of 79.

1809. Philosophical Inquiries into the Essence of Human Freedom (Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegenstände). By Schelling. Short title called "Freiheitsschrift".


1812. F.W.J. Schelling’s Monument to the writing of the Divine things of the Lord, etc. Mr. Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi: and his made the same accusation of a deliberately deceptive, lying, speaking atheism (F.W.J. Schelling’s Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen &c. des Herrn Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi: und der ihm in derselben gemachten Beschuldigung eines absichtlich täuschenden, Lüge redenden Atheismus). By Schelling. Very successful counterattack by Schelling against Jacobi. Schelling uses this as the Motto of the book, here he quotes Spinoza’s remarkable statement, "Oh, what pain! We have now reached the point where those who openly admit that they have no idea of God and would not know God in any way, that they cannot help being stupid enough to accuse the
philosophers of atheism.” At this point, Jacobi was finished philosophically at the hands of Schelling; Jacobi died March 10, 1819.

End of Chronology.

For all things about Kant, see a super-duper Kant web site by Steve Naragon (http://www.manchester.edu/kant/).
How to read Kant:
the metaphysics of metaphysics?

“This sort of investigation will always remain difficult, for it includes the metaphysics of metaphysics.’
Kant’s letter To Marcus Herz (May 11, 1781. AK 10:269)

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). How can we read Kant philosophically? What is Kant’s overall project and purpose for most of his written publications and statements? First there is the clarification of Kant’s purpose and goal. What is the nature of metaphysics for Kant? For most of the philosophical world Kant had removed metaphysics from philosophy. Kant wanted to clean up the foundations of metaphysics and wanted to prepare for constructing and doing an actually metaphysical system of nature and morals (Sitten). The overall purpose of Kant’s philosophical project was to do metaphysics. More significantly, first and foremost he had to prepare ground to lay the foundations of metaphysics. So, back to Kant’s project (Zurück nach Kant). What proceeds before a metaphysical system in general?

Before attempting to create and do a metaphysical system, the foundations have to be built of the old the so called: ‘eternal’ stones. Kant was a philosophical foundationalist by nature and by his worldview; and the arena of his philosophical thinking that was prior to metaphysics, and in fact, this is exactly the arena is where Kant’s project got stuck. Kant got stuck deep in the mud of the critical transcendental project. The vast majority of Kant’s published writings are intrinsic linked in the area that could be called “pre-metaphysical” or possible: “pro-metaphysical”. This is even clearer and of central importance when Kant uses the speculative philosophical phrase: the metaphysics of metaphysics (1781). This phrase is used as a synecdoche (συνεκδοχή), in other words, it stands for the whole of Kant’s publications in a nutshell. A guiding conceptual metaphor for where the primary thrust of Kant’s philosophy writings lies. Latin: A priori knowledge, meaning before experience. Ontological or metaphysical foundationalism.
Kant To Moses Mendelssohn. August 16, 1783.
In his discussion about the *Critique of Pure Reason*.

“One would first inquire whether the distinction between analytic and synthetic judgments is correct; whether the difficulties concerning the possibility of synthetic judgments, when these are supposed to be made a priori, are as I describe them; and whether the completing of a deduction of synthetic a priori cognitions, without which all metaphysics is impossible, is as necessary as I maintain it to be”….later in the same letter Kant says, “Meanwhile, I still hope to work out, eventually, a textbook for metaphysics, according to the critical principles I mentioned; it will have all the brevity of a handbook and be useful for academic lectures.”. Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* is foundational before doing metaphysic. Namely, Kant is doing a **metaphysics of metaphysics**.

"Metaphysics must be Science, not only as a whole, but in all its parts, otherwise it is nothing." (*Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, I. Kant, 1783). In German, ‘Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können.”

Kant was a tragic figure always wanting to write a metaphysical system but never getting to his final goal. Always doing a “Prolegomena”, but not a system. The conclusion is surprising. What are the supporting arguments? It took, Fichte, Schelling, and then Hegel to do an actual systematic metaphysics.

Hegel wrote this about his overall system of science, “The connection of the science that I call *Phenomenology of Spirit* to the Logic is thereby stated. – As regards the way it stands to it externally, a second part was intended to follow the first part of the *System Science* that contains the Phenomenology. This second part would have contained the Logic and both the two real sciences of philosophy, the Philosophy of Nature and the Philosophy of Spirit, and would have brought the system of science to completion.” (*Science of Logic*, preface to the first edition, Nürnberg, March 22, 1812).
General philosophical context.

Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) makes a bold statement about his own hermeneutical phenomenology interpretation of Kant, “(Negatively, and in opposition to the traditional interpretation of Neo-Kantianism, that means: it is no theory of mathematical, natural-scientific knowledge— it is not a theory of knowledge at all.)” (Davos Lectures in 1929, et p. 191). Indeed, Heidegger’s own look at Kant as doing the foundations for ontology is a radical interpretation of Kant. Although even a more traditional British Kantian scholar like W.H. Walsh (1913-1986), has his own problems with the relationship of metaphysics in Kant’s understanding, when he writes “It is a scandal to philosophy generally and to Kantian scholarship in particular that commentators are unable to agree about Kant's attitude to metaphysics.” And later in his erudite essay, he goes on to say that “Kant was unlike other critics of metaphysics in having suffered from the disease seriously himself. (“Kant and Metaphysics”, Kant-Studien, 67, 1976, p. 372-384). This is one typical reading of Kant as a metaphysician. However, most Kantians read Kant as rejecting metaphysics and in fact; any version of metaphysics is soundly and totally rejected. Sandbox view of Kant’s project.

Specifically, even G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) complains about this same topic in the first preface to his Science of Logic “The exoteric teaching of the Kantian philosophy — that the understanding ought not to go beyond experience, else the cognitive faculty will become a theoretical reason which itself generates nothing but fantasies of the brain — this was a justification from a philosophical quarter for the renunciation of speculative thought.” (et paragraph §3, Nürnberg, March 22, 1812). What happen to speculative thought after Kant? According to Hegel, his profound philosophy and overall “Systems of Science” of fixed this problem.

Historical note: Kant started his first lectures at Albertus-Universität Königsberg in the winter semester of 1755-1756. The topics were logic, metaphysics, mathematics, and physics. Moreover, by the year 1796 (some 42 years later) he was still teaching logic and metaphysics according to Steve Naragon (1) a sum total of 56 times for logic and 53 times on metaphysics during Kant long teaching career.
Reading Kant.

It is worth recalling, that Karl Leonhard Reinhold (1757–1823) read the *Critique of Pure Reason* starting from the back of the book and the important topics that were in the last chapters, *Letters on the Kantian Philosophy* (1786-1787, 1790). Basically, Reinhold did the marketing for Kant’s philosophy; but he did not get stuck and caught-up in the Doctrine of Elements (too abstract). But rather, morality and religion were put forward as the only part of Kant’s philosophy which was important to the general public. The question: how did Kant become famous during his lifetime when his writings were not read? Answer: Reinhold. How to read Kant’s writings was an open question even when Kant was still very much alive (died in 12 February 1803, at age 79).

Finally let us look back to what Kant himself thought, wrote and published in his major work. I think this is an indication of how Kant understood the encounter methodology of reading philosophical systems. Kant wrote:

"I note only that when we compare the thoughts that an author expresses about a subject, in ordinary speech as well as in writings, it is not at all unusual to find that we understand him even better than he understood himself, since he may not have determined his concept sufficiently and hence sometimes spoke, or even thought, contrary to his own intention." (*Critique of Pure Reason*. (A314/B370. Year 1781, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition 1787). Also in the *Prolegomena*, Kant remarks “because the author himself did not even know.” (‘weil die Verfasser selbst nicht einmal wußten’ AK 4:270. 1783).

Therefore, even Kant was well aware of this issue when reading philosophy. The philosophical reader can do better in understanding the author than the author. What were Kant’s intentions and thoughts toward his own philosophical project being read?
Where does metaphysics stand in Kant’s view?

There are six sources and metaphors that I find in Kant to focus and clarify his formal understanding of where metaphysics stood when he came upon the scene. Generally, this is developed in chronological order and Kant’s life stages. We can see this particular historical constellation of Kant’s philosophical development. The starting images of the state of metaphysics as viewed by Kant are certainly illuminating when brought together. There seems to be a consistency over this life time. Given the images derived from different writings and type of sources.

The Neo-Kantians have one thing right. For example, Otto Liebmann (1840-1912) always ended the chapters in his book *Kant and His Epigones* of 1865, with this distinct motto and slogan: “Therefore, must return to Kant” (“Also muß zur Kant zurückgegangen werden!”). Kantians all agree on the essential importance of the ‘return’ to Kant.

From the *Notes and Fragments*. (1772)
From the *Critique of Pure Reason*. (1781, 2nd edition 1787)
From the *Lectures on Metaphysics*. (1782-1783)
From the *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*. (1783)
From the *Progress* essay. (1793?)
From the *Lectures on Logic*. (Published in1800, most likely lectures from 1790s)

Kant, “In metaphysics, like an unknown land of which we intend to take possession, we have first assiduously (fleißig) investigated its situation and access to it. (It lies in the (area) hemisphere of pure reason;) we have even drawn the outline of where this island of cognition (Erkennt) is connected by bridges to the land of experience, and where it is separated by a deep sea; we have even drawn its outline and are as it were acquainted with its geography (ichnography), but we do
not know what might be found in this land, which is maintained to be uninhabitable by some people and to be their real domicile by others.” (Notes and Fragments, et p. 136. AK 17:559. 4458. 1772. ξ. M XI. E II 1134.)

Kant uses a fantasy island metaphor to talk about metaphysics in the year 1772. Kant did in fact leave Königsberg and actually saw the Baltic Sea near the town of Pillau (now known as Baltiysk). He got seasick. (die Seekrankheit, AK 7:169). For the record Kant also traveled farther inland to Gołdap (according to Kant: A Biography, Kuehn, p 450).

“Of synthetic a priori practical cognition it can also be said that it is merely subjective; the freedom (of the will) is the first – and the transcendental concepts of God and immortality apply only to the principles of my action. I should act as if there are a God and a future life. How are synthetic propositions about the supersensible possible? As regulative principles of practical cognition, not as constitutive principles of theoretical cognition. (Wie sind synthetische Satze des Übersinnlichen möglich? Als regulative Principien des Practischen, nicht als constitutive des theoretisc hen Erkentnisses).

The supersensible that is given is the concept of freedom; consequently, no synthetic-theoretical proposition that would be objectively transcendent is possible.


From the Critique of Pure Reason.

Kant begins in the first preface of the Critique of Pure Reason with the image of the "battlefield of these endless controversies is called metaphysics" (Critique of Pure Reason, Avii. 1781). He then tells us in a short story of about how in the beginning metaphysics started with "administration of the dogmatists, her rule was despotic" (Critique of Pure Reason, Aix. 1781). These battles continue and almost come to end with the famous John Locke (1632-1704), but "fell back into the same old worm-eaten dogmatism" (Critique of Pure Reason, Ax. 1781).
A hermeneutical reading of the *Critique of Pure Reason* must note the two major sections to the large written text: the Transcendental Doctrine of Elements and Transcendental Doctrine of Method. The first section on Doctrine of Elements is much longer and this is where the vast majority of readers of Kant get bogged down in the minutiae, the drawing out of distinctions, and the abstract arguments. In the second preface, Kant makes a separate statement: “It is a treatise on the method to be followed, not a system of the science itself” (2nd edition, B xxii, 1787). Thus, the second section on method is where Kant is pointing toward as the purpose of this treatise. Although Kant got trapped in endless details and arguments of the Doctrine of Elements, nevertheless, he wanted to ‘fix’ the methodology problem of metaphysics in general; and so the importance of the framing of the final sections. Kant’s true motives were to lead us out on the method and consider the methodology needed for a pre-metaphysics and for a metaphysical system as such.

The second division of the *Critique of Pure Reason* is called "Transcendental Doctrine of Method". On the first page of this division, Kant wrote: “we have made an estimate of the building materials and determined for what sort of edifice, with what height and strength, they would suffice, it turned out, of course, that although we had in mind a tower that would reach the heavens, the supply of materials sufficed only for a dwelling that was just roomy enough for our business on the plane of experience and high enough to survey it; however, that: bold undertaking had to fail from lack of material”. (*Critique of Pure Reason*, A707/B735. 1781, 2nd edition 1787). Remark: building materials is needed. A tower to reach to heaven -- such an amazing analogy and image from Kant. However, Kant was not expressing arrogance with this image, but rather, the real directions of his mind at work.

Kant says in the *Critique of Pure Reason* at the beginning of the final chapter of the entire text (history of pure reason): “I will content myself with casting a cursory glance from a merely transcendental point of view, namely that of the nature of pure reason, on the whole of its labors hitherto, which presents to my view edifices, to be sure, but only in ruins (Ruinen).” (*Critique of Pure Reason*, A852/B880. 1781, 2nd edition 1787, AK 3:550). Hence, past historical systems are totally in “ruins”. This important motif will be repeated by Kant in different writings.
From the *Lectures on Metaphysics*.

Although these are student notes, Kant is asserting his position on the current state of metaphysics in general and past history of metaphysics as well.

Kant, "The whole of metaphysics is nothing other than a chain of built-up and overthrown systems." (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, et p. 134. AK 29:779. 1782-1783, Metaphysik Mrongovius). This passage points again to Kant's remarks about the history of philosophy being in ruins and broken down. Another passage from this lecture period says, "Up to now in metaphysics we still have not had anything satisfactory, for all systems can be shaken.' (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, et p. 127. AK 29:765. 1782-1783, the collection is called the Metaphysik Mrongovius 2, AK 29:747-940, Marburg Kant-Archiv (Film 4).

Put differently, Kant is saying that there are no blocks and nothing to use to build his new system and all of the past metaphysical systems historical are overthrown and shaken to the core as metaphysics is broken. The science of metaphysics at this point for Kant has weakened and descended; therefore finally, has gone into ruins.

From the *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science*.

*Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science* (1783) was written in response to making the *Critique of Pure Reason* (1st edition published 1781); more readable after Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786) reported found it too difficult and had set the book down (letter from Kant to Marcus Herz 11 May 1781 (AK 10:270). And then in January 19, 1782, a philosopher Christian Garve (1742-1798) published an anonymous review of the *Critique of Pure Reason* it was published in ‘Göttingischen Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen’. The so called Garve-Feder review made Kant upset and he decided to write a shorter work called the *Prolegomena* to explain his position in a different and shorter way than in *Critique of Pure Reason*. Kant called the new approach is called the analytic method for the *Prolegomena*; as compared to a
synthetic method used in the lengthy *Critique of Pure Reason* (see *Prolegomena*, AK 4:263, et p. 60).

Kant, “The previous work, which presents the faculty of pure reason in its entire extent and boundaries, thereby always remains the foundation to which the *Prolegomena* refer only as preparatory exercises; for this critique must stand forth as science, systematic and complete to its smallest parts, before one can think of permitting metaphysics to come forward, or even of forming only a distant hope for metaphysics.” (*Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science*, et p.11. AK 4:261. 1783).

Thus, Kant’s metaphysics has not yet come forward. Remember this was indeed, a called a *Prolegomena*.

Kant, “It can be said that the whole of transcendental philosophy, which necessarily precedes (nothwendig vorhergeht) all of metaphysics, is itself nothing other than simply the complete solution of the question presented here, but in systematic order and detail, and that until now there has therefore been no transcendental philosophy; for what goes under this name is really a part of metaphysics, but this science is to settle the possibility of metaphysics in the first place, and therefore must precede all metaphysics.” (*Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science (Wissenschaft)* et p. 30 AK 4:279).

Remark: is an actual metaphysics possible? And what must necessarily “precede” metaphysics? Kant had his whole metaphysics (philosophical) project needing clarification. In this same section Kant writes, “whole [entirely] new science” (ganz neue Wissenschaft). (AK 4:279). The new science must be in order to answer this one question sufficiently – that is, how is metaphysics possible without the preceding science? In short, the new science needed is a meta-metaphysics.

Kant, “But although the time for the decline (Verfalls) of all dogmatic metaphysics is undoubtedly here, much is still lacking in order to be able to say that, on the contrary, the time for its rebirth, through a thorough and completed critique of reason, has already appeared.” (*Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science (Wissenschaft)* et p. 118 AK 4:367).
The Leibniz-Wolff tradition of dogmatic metaphysics has declined and now we have Kant who will revitalize metaphysics after clearing the way and providing for a new path. The word for new rebirth that Kant uses is “Wiedergeburt”. Sometime translated from German into English as ‘renaissance’; thus, there is a new time and beginning for metaphysics as such.

From the ‘Progress’ Essay.

Kant started writing this unpublished work in November 1793. The title is: What Real Progress Has Metaphysics Made in Germany since the Time of Leibniz and Wolff? The German title is: Welches sind die wirklichen Fortschritte, die Metaphysik seit Leibnizens und Wolffs Zeiten in Deutschland gemacht hat? This work on metaphysics (short title is often called: Progress) by Kant was given to and edited by his friend and dinner confidant Friedrich Theodor Rink (the manuscripts have subsequently been lost), and he published this shortly after Kant’s death in April 1804. Kant’s essay was in response to a prize question announced by the Royal Academy of Sciences (Académie Royal des Sciences et des Belles-Lettres of Berlin, deadline changed 1790, 1792, and extended finally to June 1, 1795). Historical note; sometime this Academy is called by a German name: Königlich Preussische Academie der Wissenschaften.(2) Kant in the end did not submit his manuscript for publication or attempt to contest for the prize money which was 50 ducats. In this work, Kant gives us several different versions of his metahistory of philosophy as metaphysics; and as such, it is an extremely interesting statement of Kant’s theoretical philosophy late in his life. I think this is the most important of Kant’s unpublished writings.

Kant, “But this science is metaphysics, and that completely changes matters. This is a shoreless sea in which progress leaves no trace behind, and on whose horizon, there is no visible goal by which one might perceive how nearly it has been approached.” (Progress, et p. 51. AK 20:259. 1793).

In short, this is a precise and strong image of being at sea without anything in view. The words are of a boundless or shoreless sea (uferloses Meer). Indeed, there is no progress (Fortschritt) for metaphysics; which should be noted (nota bene) is either everything (Alles) or nothing according to Kant (Progress, AK
20:259. 1793). Kant thinks that if metaphysics is done right it is then “everything” for humans.

“The old name of this science, μετὰ τὰ φυσικά (meta ta physika), already gives a pointer to the kind of knowledge at which its aim was directed. The purpose is to proceed by means of it beyond all objects of possible experience (Erfahrung) (trans physicam), in order, where possible, to know that which absolutely cannot be an object thereof, and hence the definition of metaphysics, which contains the reason for advocating such a science, would be: It is a science of progressing (fortzuschreiten) from knowledge of the sensible (Sinnlichen) to that of the supersensible (Übersinnlichen).” (Progress, AK 20:316. 1793).

A Kantian note on the word, Übersinnlichen (the supersensuous). Translation note: Übersinnlichen could be translated as oversensuous or oversense or oversensorial.
Kant in the unpublished essay, What Real Progress has Metaphysics Made in Germany Since the Time of Leibniz and Wolff? of 1793 defines metaphysics as “the science of advancing by reason from knowledge of the sensible (Sinnliche) to the knowledge of the supersensuous. (Progress, et. p. 53). The object of the Kantian problem is the transition from the sensible (sensory) to supersensuous. There are three objects or components to the supersensuous, namely, God, freedom, and immortality (Progress, et. p. 294-295). But what can we know of these objects?

In the second preface to the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant said, “Now after speculative reason has been denied all advance in this field of the supersensuous…” (CPR, Bxxi). Kant was not happy about this and went on to say in the same paragraph that “cognitions a prior that are possible, but only from a practical intention.” (praktischer Absicht) (CPR, Bxxi).
Kant, “Every philosophical thinker builds his own work, so to be speak on someone’s else’s ruins, but no work has ever come to be that was to be lasting in all its parts.” (Lectures on Logic, et. p. 538. Jäsche Logic, published in 1800, AK 16).

In summary, the foregoing sketches show us Kant needing to ‘fix’ the foundations for metaphysics. Metaphysics in the past had failed; but metaphysics is stilled needed for the human race. The metaphors of Kant show metaphysics to be in a crucial state of affairs, in other words, metaphysics in distress (as such). What are the metaphors that Kant uses? These sketches are germane to a deeper considerate of Kant thought.

Dogmatic metaphysics was part of the overthrown and shaken systems of the past; and was in ruins without leaving any blocks or materials to build a new foundation. What is the status of metaphysics or the science of metaphysics? There is no progress in this science and we are left just bobbing around in the sea without anything in sight. This is metaphysics as Kant envisions its nature at his time and period in history. Clarification in this case is the final denouement.

What is Kant’s fundamental philosophical project?

Major thesis of this essay:

Kant’s primary task and philosophical purpose was to do a metaphysics of morals and nature. By 1773, Kant was clear on his main overall project to produce and write a metaphysical system of morals and nature (see also Kant’s fascinating diagram (2) of the structure of metaphysics circa 1776-1778, the terms used in German are: Metaphysik der Natur und Sitten, AK 18:9. 4851). Unlike many other philosophers, Kant before doing a metaphysical system, needed to clarify the foundations on which to build a metaphysical system. Nevertheless, Kant even into the 1790s was not yet ready to do his own metaphysical system. Kant’s main thrust is not as an epistemologist (contra the Marburg School of Neo-Kantianism).
Kant’s last major work published still had the word “foundations” or sometimes translated at “first principle” (Anfangsgründe) in the two major parts of the *Metaphysics of Morals* (1797). Theoretical foundationalism for Kant is before and proceeds metaphysics. The fundamental foundations of metaphysics need to be critiqued and clarified before moving forward creating an actual metaphysical system. Moreover, Kant can be seen as providing for a propaedeutic of metaphysics. Kant’s thought got stuck in providing for the foundations of a metaphysics of morals and nature. Basically, Kant sometimes calls it a whole new science that is presupposed by metaphysics; and again, his precise phrase: “the metaphysics of metaphysics”.

**A Reading of Kant**

One way to read Kant is just to look at the titles of Kant’s written works over time. The words are a sign and indication of Kant’s project of clarification of the foundations before doing a metaphysical system in general. For example, the strong word, critique (Kritik); three critiques (1781, 1788, 1790) (2nd edition 1787). The word “critique” for Kant is about the sources and boundaries before doing the science (Wissenschaft) in general. Note the other term used in by Kant in German is Wissenschaft, which is more general than the way the word ‘science’ is used in English today. Think of Wissenschaft rather like the term from Aristotle or Plato, the Greek word ἐπιστήμη (epistēmē) as opposed to δόξα (doxa) [or even ἄγνωστος (agnōsis)]. Next the term: Prolegomena in the Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können (1783). Prolegomena is a preliminary essay. Note the prefix is “pro– “in the word Prolegomena, with the prefix meaning ‘before’. The next word is “grounding”; which comes from the title of the Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten (1785). Kant published the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. This is clear in the use of the word “foundations” as in the *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science* (Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft (1786)). Kant’s last major work to be published was *The Metaphysics of Morals* (1797) and essentially was published first in to two parts: (in 1797, January and August, respectively). The two parts are titled: *Metaphysical Foundations of the Theory of Law* and *Metaphysical Foundations of the theory of virtue*. Note the German word
“Anfangsgründe” appears in both titles. The English translation is “foundations” or maybe the ‘original ground’.

Heidegger wrote, the “Kantbook, an attempt to question what had not been said, instead of writing in a fixed way about what Kant said. What has been said is insufficient, what has not been said is filled with riches.” (Kant and the problem of Metaphysics, et p.175). Of course, Heidegger is attacking the Neo-Kantians and the attempt to have one way (fixed) to write about Kant and Kant’s philosophical thought. At this point, it is difficult to read Kant without the background of 'Erkenntnistheorie' or theory of knowledge; or, in general, reading Kant as doing some kind of epistemology project –namely, as so many of the Neo-Kantians interpreted Kant’s philosophical project. The Neo-Kantians had the general idea that philosophy as such; was only one, just one great philosopher, namely, -- Kant. For example, Otto Liebmann's aphorism: "You can philosophize with Kant, or you can philosophize against Kant, but you cannot philosophize without Kant."

Wilhelm Windelband (1848-1915) made the famous claim that; "All nineteenth-century philosophers are Kantians." Neo-Kantianism was a major philosophical movement during the last 200 years. How does the Neo-Kantianism's problematic still shape the current philosophical landscape and any possible reading of Kant? Contemporary thinking has to work on the following questions. Can we go beyond Kant? Can we go beyond the Neo-Kantians? The totally misguided epistemology interpretation of Kant's is still the dominant interpretation today. Only by going back to truly read Kant’s writings, can we ever think of revealing Kant’s authentic problematic.

From Kant’s Letters

The best sources of Kant’s statements on his intentions of future philosophical projects are in his letters. Kant mentions various project and timeline, some of these projects never happen; but Kant’s intentions were never clearer. These timelines, of course where often incorrect as philosophical publications are not always on schedule, and Kant had a lot to think about as he developed his philosophical projects. Kant was also busy teachings as well. He began in the winter semester of 1755-1756 (age 31), and completed 284 courses by 1796
(according to Steve Naragon,2). The name was Albertus-Universität Königsberg. During this period Kant correspondent with a number of famous and some not so famous men. Many of these people, Kant had taught or had meet. In the Academic Edition of Kant’s written letters are in Section II. Briefwechsel (volumes 10-13, AK: 10-13).

Kant, “What I am working on is mainly a book on the proper method of metaphysics (and thereby also the proper method for the whole of philosophy).” To Johann Heinrich Lambert, December 31, 1765. (AK 10:56). Kant’s age is 41.

The proper method for metaphysics? Rules for the Direction of the Mind (started in 1619 and left unfinished in 1628) by René Descartes (1596-1650), number four: “There is need of a method for finding out the truth.” Or to rephrase this remark, "no truth without method". Kant knew he needed to concentrate on the methodology question for metaphysics and this is early in Kant philosophical journey, in the year 1765.

Kant letter 1766, “As to my expressed opinion of the value of metaphysics in general, perhaps here and again my words were not sufficiently careful and qualified. But I cannot conceal my repugnance, and even a certain hatred, toward the inflated arrogance of whole volumes full of what are passed off nowadays as insights; for I am fully convinced that the path that has been selected is completely wrong, that the methods now in vogue must infinitely increase the amount of folly and error in the world, and that even the total extermination of all these chimerical insights would be less harmful than the dream science itself, with its confounded contagion. I am far from regarding metaphysics itself, objectively considered, to be trivial or dispensable; in fact, I have been convinced for some time now that I understand its nature and its proper place in human knowledge and that the true and lasting welfare of the human race depends on it—an appraisal that would seem fantastic and audacious to anyone but you.” To Moses Mendelssohn, April 8, 1766. (AK 10:70-71).

What is the value of metaphysics for the humans and best welfare of humans? For Kant, the human race needs and depends on metaphysics. Kant in his lectures on metaphysics wrote: “Metaphysics is the spirit of philosophy. It is related to philosophy as the spirit of wine (spiritus vini) is to wine. It purifies out elementary
concepts and thereby makes us capable of comprehending all sciences. In short, it
is the greatest culture of the human understanding.” (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, et. p
286. Metaphysik Mrongovius, AK 29:940). And the importance of metaphysics in
general, Kant writes: “Just for this reason metaphysics is also the culmination of all
culture of human reason...” (*Critique of Pure Reason*, A851/B879. 1781, 2nd
edition 1787).

Kant letter 1772, “…and was then making plans for a work that might perhaps
have the title, "The Limits of Sense and Reason." I planned to have it consist of
two parts, a theoretical and a practical. The first part would have two sections, (I)
general phenomenology and (2) metaphysics, but this only with regard to its nature
and method. The second part likewise would have two sections, (1) the universal
principles of feeling, taste, and sensuous desire and (2) the basic principles of
morality.” To Marcus Herz, February 21, 1772. (AK 10:129-130).

This letter was made very famous by a book written by Peter Strawson (*The
Bounds of Sense*, 1966, the catch word was “Sense” or ‘Sinnlichkeit’); but
Strawson did not see that for Kant the second part was to be a metaphysical
foundation clarification (method again) and that it was to lead to metaphysical
system – in this case, aesthetic and the principles (principiorum, αρχη, archê) of
morality. Kant’s version and definition of the word “Phänomenologie,
phenomenology” is different than Hegel (used in 1807), or more recently Franz
Clemens Brentano (1838–1917), Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) and even
Heidegger’s use of the decisive term. In Kant, the word “Phänomenologie”, in this
letter 1772, will appear again in *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science
(Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft* (1786), “Viertes
Hauptstück. Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Phänomenologie”, AK 4:554). The
German word “Phänomenologie” was used first by Johann Heinrich Lambert (Kant
exchanged letters with him). Obviously, this is an “awakening” project as outlined
by Kant and some of details changed after 1772. However, at this point there was
a beginning of the project under development; and with many of the basic and key
concepts were written down and were at the forefront of Kant’s thought. This letter
is having been the subject of attention of many Kantians, since it is having the
rudimental seeds of number important recurring themes in Kant’s philosophy. He
goes on to write and publish the third and final of the critiques: *Kritik der
Urteilskraft* 1790 [AK 5:165-486] and this has been translated into English as the
“Critique of the Power of Judgment.” This covers the area of “feeling, taste, and sensuous desire” as mentioned in this letter of 1772; or for Kant this general area of aesthetics. Kant covers this in the letter with the remark, “General principles the sense of taste and sensual desire”. (“Allgemeine Principien des Gefühls des Geschmacks und der sinnlichen Begierde.”) To Marcus Herz, February 21, 1772. AK 10:129). Historical note: Kant did not teach on aesthetics (see Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten’s (1714-1762) well known book entitled *Aesthetica* (1750). This book provides the extensive philosophical background for Kant’s aesthetics.

Kant, “I shall be glad when I have finished my transcendental philosophy, which is actually a critique of pure reason, as then I can turn to metaphysics, which has only two parts, the metaphysics of nature and the metaphysics of morals, of which I shall present the latter first. I therefore look forward to the future.” To Marcus Herz, toward end of 1773. (AK 10:145).

Remarks: this passage, I think is Kant’s ultimate philosophical vision and project! At this essential point, the goal and purpose of Kant’s philosophy is to do, “the metaphysics of nature and the metaphysics of morals”. Kant’s friend and student, Marcus Herz (1747-1803) also obtained a M.D. (degree 1774) and hence was a physician; so, Kant was also confessing his private medical conditions to Dr. Herz, M.D.; and indeed, his personal philosophical intentions and his multifarious projects. Thus, first the transcendental philosophy (all of the three critiques fall into this category) must be completed; and then Kant can move on to the real goal and final target of the Kantian philosophy – namely, metaphysics. In the year 1773, this is “metaphysics of nature and the metaphysics of morals”.

Kant letter 1781, “This sort of investigation will always remain difficult, for it includes the metaphysics of metaphysics. Yet I have a plan in mind according to which even popularity might be gained for this study, a plan that could not be carried out initially, however, for the foundations needed cleaning up, particularly because the whole system of this sort of knowledge had to be exhibited in all its articulation.” To Marcus Herz, about May 11, 1781. (AK 10:269).

Planning and clearing up the foundations, hence, moving toward the penultimate goal – the metaphysics of metaphysics. This first project is the pre-metaphysical foundations. Ontological or metaphysical foundationalism.
Kant letter 1783, “Be so kind as to have another fleeting glance at the whole and to notice that it is not at all metaphysics that the *Critique* is doing but a whole new science, never before attempted, namely, the critique of *an a priori judging* reason. Other men have touched on this faculty, for instance, Locke and Leibnitz, but always with an admixture of other faculties of knowing.” To Christian Garve, August 7, 1783. (AK 10:340).

The “whole new science” project is not metaphysics, but the *Critique of Pure Reason* has to be done first and before (*a prior*) any metaphysical system. Kant is working on the clarification of a whole new science and methodology.

Kant letter 1783, “I hope that this will have the effect I desire and bring new life and decisive results to the long-neglect project of metaphysics.” To Johann Schultz August 26, 1783. (AK 10:351).

Thus, as of 1783, Kant had neglected his basic metaphysic project. Remember at this point, Kant had taught metaphysics for over 25 years (Steve Naragon). Kant mentioned in a letter to Mendelssohn (16 August 1783) that was hoping to write his own metaphysics textbook:

Kant wrote, “I still hope to work out, eventually, a textbook for metaphysics, according to the critical principles I mentioned; it will have all the brevity of a handbook and be useful for academic lectures. It hope to finish it sometime or other, perhaps in the distant future.“ [AK 10:346; et p. 203]

Kant letter 1786, “Since, if I am successful with this project, almost any insightful person would be able to construct a system of metaphysics in conformity with my theory, I am therefore putting off my own composition of such a system for a while longer, in order to gain time for my system of practical philosophy…” To Johann Bering, April 7, 1786. (AK 10:441).

Here it is clear that Kant in not working on a metaphysical system; but the goal is to enable doing a metaphysical system as such.

Kant, I have never written a metaphysics;” Several sentences later Kant (letter 1787), continues:
“I wish you would try to compose a short system of metaphysics for the time being; I don't have the time to propose a plan for it just now. The ontology part of it would begin (without the introduction of any critical ideas) with the concepts of space and time, only insofar as these (as pure intuitions) are the foundation of all experiences. After that, there are four main parts that would follow, containing the concepts of the understanding, divided according to the four classes of categories, each of which constitutes a section.” To Ludwig Heinrich Jakob September 11(?), 1787. (AK 10:494-495).

This is about the time Kant was working on the 2nd edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Here Kant is introducing the notion of someone creating or “composing” a system of metaphysics. This is the second time that Kant writes to someone to take on the task of writing a typical metaphysical system. The first time was the Herz letter of 1772, some 15 years earlier.

Kant letter 1789, “I who in my 66th year am still burdened with the extensive work of completing my plan (partly in producing the last part of the critique, namely, that of judgment, which should appear soon, and partly in working out a system of metaphysics, of nature as well as of morals, in conformity with those critical demands).” To Marcus Herz, May 26, 1789. (AK 11:48-49).

Thus, here at the end of the three critiques at the age of 66 (his great works completed), Kant is again thinking of his major project, his ultimate project – which is system of metaphysics of nature and morals. Remember this was announced in the 1773 letter (Herz) and outlined in the 1776 metaphysics diagram and sketch. At this point, Kant is having problems and is only able to teach two courses per semester in the year 1789 (and see his letter to Karl Leonard Reinhold (21 September 1791, AK 11:288). In the year 1791, he says, the last two years his mental powers (“allein die Disposition zu Kopfarbeiten”) and disposition are slowing; and by five years later July 23rd, 1796 Kant has stopped teaching at all (age 72). Kant lectured for 41 years or 82 semesters and most of this career he taught 36 hours per week (according to Steve Naragon).

Kant letter 1790, “At the same time permit me to explain that the efforts at criticism I have heretofore made are in no way meant (as they might appear to be) to attack the Leibniz-Wolffian philosophy (for I find the later neglected in recent
times). My aim is rather to pursue the same track according to a rigorous procedure and, by means of it, to reach the same goal, but only via a detour that, it appears to me, those great men seem to have regarded as superfluous: the union of theoretical and practical philosophy. This intention of mine will be clearer when, if I live long enough, I complete the reconstruction of metaphysics in a coherent system.” To Abraham Gotthelf Kastner August 5, 1790. (AK 11:186).

The same goal means in this context: metaphysics. Here in the period of 1790, Kant is hoping to get around to creating a coherent metaphysical system. Nevertheless, time is passing Kant quickly at this point in his philosophical development and his life. Again note, by this time Kant is teaching less because of ‘difficulties’.

Kant letter 1792, “you have presented me with your thorough investigation of what is just the hardest thing in the whole Critique, namely, the analysis of an experience in general and the principles of its possibility. I have already planned a system of metaphysics to overcome these difficulties…” To Jakob Sigismund Beck, January 20, 1792. (AK 11:313). Kant’s age is 67. Note in April 1793, Beck published two volumes about the Kantian philosophy; the titles were Erläuternder Auszug aus den kritischen Schriften des Herrn Prof. Kant, auf Anrathen desselben. Parts of which were translated into English in 1797 by John Richardson; and hence Kant’s worldwide fame had begun.

Two years later in 1792, Kant is still planning a “metaphysical system”. Has Kant created a metaphysical system? Answer: no, still in the planning stage as of 1792. But five years later Kant will publish: The Metaphysics of Morals (1797); however, the actual book has the word “foundations” (Anfangsgründe) as part of the two main sections. Was this the metaphysics of morals that Kant has been planning since 1773 (24 years before)? Answer: no, this is still cleaning up the primary foundations.

In summary, the foregoing sketches from his letters show us Kant pursing his goal over the course of his life time; and tragically, he never got to the planned metaphysical system. Kant was the sentinel for ‘metaphysics’ of his day; but in the end his final goal was unfilled.
Kant's Metahistory of philosophy

SECTION: Critique of Pure Reason

Let us begin by looking at the final section of the Critique of Pure Reason (CPR) (Kritik der reinen Vernunft). The section is called, “The Transcendental Doctrine of Method. Fourth Chapter. The History of pure reason.” (CPR, A852/B800 to A855/B883). Kant starts of by talking about “place that is left open in his system and must be filled in the future.” It is interesting to note the same kind of issue Kant talked about in his last unpublished work, the Opus postumum (written 1796-1804). This was collection of writings that Kant was working on very late life and he did not finalize or published. Sometime Kant talks about a ‘transition’, then a ‘gap’, a ‘pain like that of Tantalus’, and then the “unpaid bill of my uncompleted system” (Letter Christian Garve, September 21, 1798). This is in regard to the “Transition from metaphysical foundations of natural science to physics.” This heading appears early in the Opus postumum (et. p. 10, AK 21:373).

So, where is the other part of which Kant had promised, “must be filled in the future” (CPR, A852/B880) in the Critique of Pure Reason? Namely, the complete history of pure reason or a comprehensive history of philosophy. Kant never did work out a detailed history of philosophy or a history of pure reason. In fact, where Kant left holes or gaps in his philosophical system, then philosophers have rushed in to complete the Kantian project. The neo-Kantians, Friedrich Adolf Trendelenburg (1802-1872) and Wilhelm Windelband (1848-1915) are some examples of philosophers who have developed in the history of philosophy.

Now back to Kant’s outline of pure reason in the Critique of Pure Reason.

Kant starts by giving a ‘cursory outline’ of the ‘chief revolutions’ in metaphysics (CPR, A855/B881). There are three points in this small section.

1) “With regard to the object of all of our rational cognitions”.

Kant said we have the sensual philosophers (Epicurus, 342-270 BC) and the intellectual philosophers (Plato, 427-348 BC).
2) “With regard to the origin of pure cognitions of reason” (Vernunftverkenntnisse). Kant said we have the empiricist (Aristotle 384-322 BC, John Locke 1632-1704) and noologists (Plato, Leibniz 1646-1716).


Kant said we have the naturalistic (Democritus 460-370 BC) and the scientific methodology. The scientific leads to either the dogmatism (Christian Wolff (1679-1754) or skepticism (David Hume (1711-1776). In this same section, Kant concludes that the “critical path alone is still open” (CPR, A855/B883). This is very last page of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Note: Kant in this section does not say “Wissenschaft,” but rather, “szientifische” methodology (szientifischen Methode). Why does he use this word?

This points back to the Preface of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, where Kant says, “It is treatise on the method” (CPR, Bxxii). Kant sees himself within the history of metaphysics working on a subsection under ‘method’ and then ‘scientific’. The location within metaphysics for the Kantian ‘critical path’ is under the direction of method, and then scientific headings.

Kant begins the *Critique of Pure Reason* with the image of the “battlefield of these endless controversies is called metaphysics” (CPR, Avii). He then tells us a little story of about how in the beginning metaphysics started with “administration of the dogmatists, her rule was despotic” (CPR, Aix). These battles continue and almost come to end with the famous John Locke (1632-1704), but “fell back into the same old worm-eaten dogmatism” (CPR, Ax). Thus, the text of the *Critique of Pure Reason* begins with the history of philosophy and then the final section is called the history of pure reason (Die Geschichte der reinen Vernunft). Within this beginning and ending is this treatise on the method of the “metaphysics of metaphysics”, namely, the *Critique of Pure Reason* (Letter To Marcus Herz, May 11, 1781, *Correspondence*, et. p. 181). So, Kant is situating himself within his own history of pure reason, that is, within his own Metahistory of philosophy.

Kant says at the beginning of the chapter on the history of pure reason:

I will content myself with casting a cursory glance from a merely transcendental point of view, namely that of the nature of pure reason, on the whole of its labors
hitherto, which presents to my view edifices, to be sure, but only in ruins. (CPR, A852/B880). (Beginning of chapter, Die Geschichte der reinen Vernunft).

There are two important points here.

1) Kant is going to look at the history of pure reason, that is, the history of philosophy from a special point of view, namely, the “transcendental point of view”. Or, in other words, from Kant’s own point of view. This is a Metahistory of Philosophy from the transcendental point of view (transzendentalen Gesichtspunkte). The uniquely Kantian position.

2) The past is in “ruins” (Ruinen). Note this point very well. This is crucial point and conclusion for Kant.

Kant often uses these analogies and images of building a house. The second division of the Critique of Pure Reason is called “Transcendental doctrine of method”. On the incredibly first page we hear Kant’s images. He talks of the building edifices, building materials, height, strength, erection of a sturdy dwelling, etc. (CPR, A707/B735). Thus, when we come to the last chapter of the section and we hear from Kant that there are ‘only ruins,’ then keeping with this analogy from Kant’s view there is nothing to really ‘build-on’ from history of philosophy. Therefore, I understand Kant’s own position (from the ‘transcendental point of view’) that the history of philosophy is not helpful or important, it is in ‘ruins. I understand Kant is saying that Kant’s own transcendental or critical idealism is not based on the history of philosophy and it totally unique to Kant. In other words, Kant has to begin his building from the ground-up or from the essential foundations. There is nothing to build-on, only a little dirt to begin the building. Therefore, sticking with this image, for Kant, the ground is reason.

Kant wanted to develop is his own metaphysical system, but somewhere he got trapped writing the Critique of Pure Reason. He said in a letter that it would take him three months (1772) to finish his work. In reality, it took him another nine years before the Critique of Pure Reason (1781) was published. Here we start to see why. All Kant sees is ‘ruins’ everywhere. He does not have any building materials to even begin to build a sturdy dwelling (namely, a metaphysical system, a system of science).
Kant is doing a propaedeutic. That is just getting the ground ready for the building process or Kant in another publication he calls it a prolegomena. Now, this is not the science or a doctrine or in terms of the image – this is not the sturdy dwelling, but rather, a propaedeutic, that is, laying out the foundational project (think of Heidegger’s *Kant and Problem of Metaphysics*). Kant said in an early part of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, “…we can regard a science of the mere estimation of pure reason, of its sources and boundaries, as the propaedeutic to the system of pure reason. Such a thing would not be a doctrine, but must be called only a critique of pure reason…” (CPR, A11). From the ruins there are no blocks to build a metaphysical system or a system built on science. In other words, this is neither a Wissenschaft nor scientifische system. This points to why Kant had to do a “critique” before getting to the real knowledge of metaphysics. From this point of view the critique of pure reason project is not metaphysics, but rather a “critique” of reason, which needs to be done before the science of a metaphysical system. That is why Kant called the *Critique* a “metaphysics of metaphysics”. The fundamental foundation, the ground, before doing the project of metaphysics. But for Kant this is not some kind of special physics in the Aristotelian sense, but rather the critique of pure reason. Aristotle would not understand the project, which is why Kant is so unique.

SECTION: What Real Progress has Metaphysics Made in Germany Since the Time of Leibniz and Wolff?

Kant wrote this work in 1793. The German title is: *Welches sind die wirklich Fortschritte, die Metaphysik seit Leibnizens und Wolffs Zeiten in Deutschland gemacht hat?* This was about the same time he was working on *Religion within the Bounds of Unaided (blossen) Reason*. This work (*Progress*) by Kant was edited by Friedrich Rink (the manuscripts have subsequently been lost) and published shortly after Kant’s death in April 1804. Kant’s work was in a response to prize question announced by the Royal Academy of Sciences (Berlin, January 24, 1788). Kant in the end did not submit his manuscript. Nevertheless, we have with this work another attempt by Kant to look at the past in philosophy and we might see if another facet of Kant’s Metahistory of philosophy comes forward into the light.
Kant right in the beginning of the Introduction gives us a picture of his view of metaphysics. Kant said,

“But this science is metaphysics, and that completely changes matters. This is a boundless sea in which progress leaves no trace and, on whose horizon, there is no visible destination that allows one to perceive how near one has come to it.” (et. p. 51).

There is no trace of anything good left, namely, no progress. The boundless sea is without a history and without even a horizon to navigate the ship. Kant is lost at sea. The sea is the history of metaphysics or at the very least, just the lost sea of metaphysics in general. Kant abruptly, then drops an interesting remark; “Ontology has made little progress since Aristotle’s time” (et. p. 53). (Perhaps Martin Heidegger would agree with him. He told a group of students to read Aristotle first for 15 years, before reading Nietzsche).

Kant then goes on to talk about the three steps taken by metaphysics.

Thus, philosophy has gone through three stages in regard to metaphysics. The first was the stage of dogmatism, the second skepticism, and third the criticism of pure reason. (et p. 61).

This sounds again like Gottfried Wilhelm Freiherr Von Leibniz (1646-1716) and Wolff (Wolff’s follower, Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1714-1762), Kant used his Metaphysics (1757) in his lectures), Hume, and then Kant. When Kant thinks of skepticism, I think in this context it must be Hume. Although already in December of 1792, in a letter to Jacob Sigismund Beck, Kant mentions the assumed name of Aenesidemus (real name is: Gottlob Ernst Schulze, 1761-1833) where “an even wider skepticism has been advanced” (Correspondence, et. p. 445). The complete title of the book was Aenesidemus oder über die Fundamente der von Herrn Professor Reinhold in Jena gelieferten Elementar-Philosophie, 1792. In Germany, Schulze’s name during this time became synonymous with skepticism. Kant might also be thinking of the early Greek skeptics. For example, Kant mentions in a different context, “Pyrrho among others was a great Skeptic” (Lectures on Metaphysics, et. p. 305). Plus, on the same page he says, “Sextus Empiricus, who brought all doubts together” (Lectures on Metaphysics, et. p. 305).
Thus, Kant was well acquainted with skepticism from a variety of sources in the complete history of philosophy.

How did Kant see these three stages in metaphysics?

Kant said,

“This temporal order is based on the nature of the human capacity for knowledge. When the first two had been gone through, metaphysics was in such a state that for many generations it swung from unbounded trust in reason in itself to boundless mistrust and then back again.” (Progress, et p. 61).

So, Kant is saying in this remark that Metahistory is based on “human capacity (Erkenntnisvermogens). Then Kant describes a process of trust (Vertrauen) or not trusts in reason. But clearly the movement and motion within history is a ‘swinging’ (schwankend, vacillation, wavering) back and forth between the two opposites of ‘unbounded’ and ‘boundless’ trust in reason. Thus, at this point Metahistory of philosophy is the swinging between trust and not trust in reason. Kant can see himself in this process as being for the trust in reason. In other words, Kant is on the side of rationalism. The Kantian Metahistory of philosophy is a process between reason (ratio) and reasonlessness (note: this is not irrationalism; we must wait 100 years before this becomes an issue).

Perhaps Kant saw Schulze’s contemporary skepticism as just part of the process. However, at the time, Karl Leonhard Reinhold’s (1758-1823) widespread popularization of Kant’s philosophy was underway and then Schulze devastating critique of Reinhold’s Kantianism as an infinite regress obviously upset Kant’s agenda. Even Hegel had to come to terms with contemporary skepticism in his essay; “On the Relationship of Skepticism to Philosophy, Exposition of its Different Modifications and Comparison of the Latest Form with the Ancient One,” (1802) (Kritisches Journal der Philosophie) which is a critical discuss and review of Schulze's work. In this way Kant’s Metahistory of philosophy could take into account the contemporary philosophical schools of his time.
Section: *Lectures on Logic*

*The Blomberg Logic*

Kant learned a great deal about the history of philosophy from the work of Johann Formey (1711-1797), *Kurzgesfasste Historie der Philosophie von Herrn Formey*, Berlin 1763 (*Abridged History of Philosophy*). Kant wrote Formey a letter in June 28, 1763 (*Correspondence*, et. p. 69-70) and often had people send Formey copies of Kant’s works (*Correspondence*, et. p. 88). Formey was the permanent secretary of the Berlin Royal Academy of Sciences, he was a Wolffian, and wrote over 600 books and 20,000 letters. It is not clear where Kant came up with the critical remarks about Greek philosophers, since he read Plato and Aristotle in Greek. Perhaps it was Formey’s views, for example, Kant remarked, “Plato was very rhetorical, and obscure, and in such way that he often did not understand himself. (*Lectures on Logic*, et. p. 23). About Aristotle, Kant said, “Aristotle developed a blind trust in himself, and he harmed philosophia more than he helped it.” (*Lecture on Logic*, et. p. 23). Is this Kant or could this be Formey view of the history of philosophy?

Kant is of course talking through the lecture notes of his students. In this case, the *Blomberg Logic* was based on Kant’s lectures of the early 1770s. Kant in one part of his lectures talks about the ancient philosophers as being either skeptical or dogmatists. This is a familiar refrain from Kant. However, he does go on to says, “Carteius, Malebranche, Leibniz, and Wolffus, the last whom, through his industry, produced a *systema* of philosophy, were in recent times the ones who improved philosophy, and were its true fathers. All of the efforts of our philosophy are 1) dogmatic, 2) critical. Among critical philosophers Locke deserves priority.” (*Lectures on Logic*, et. p. 24).

Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* was reviewed 1782 by J.G.H. Feder (1740-1820). In this review Kant was portrayed as just restating Bishop George Berkeley’s (1685-1753) Idealism and Kant responded is the second edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason* (2nd edition, 1787). However, in this passage we note two things of interest: a) Kant points to more recent philosophers as the ‘true fathers’ of philosophy, b) again Locke seems to be praised for his importance. Kant often has critical remarks about Berkeley, for example, calling him a “dogmatic idealism”
(CRP, B274). Kant discusses this whole issue with Berkeley in his “Refutation of Idealism” (CRP, B274-287).

In the *Dohna-Wundlacken Logic* (1792), Kant said, “Dogmatism and skepticism are opposed to one another” (*Lectures on Logic*, et. p. 745). He then goes and states his position, “Criticism is the middle way between dogmatism and skepticism, the principle of a rightful trust in one’s use of reason” (*Lectures on Logic*, et. p. 480).

This shows Kant working and thinking through his relation to earlier philosophers and the history of philosophy. Although it does not give us anymore-direct insight into Kant’s Metahistory of philosophy, it does show his thoughtful dialogue with past philosophers.

Section: *Lectures on Metaphysics*

Kant’s point of view on the history of metaphysics can be summarized by one of his remarks, “The whole of metaphysics is nothing other than a chain of built-up and overthrown systems.” (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, et. p. 134). This passage points again to Kant’s remarks about the history of philosophy being in ruins. Another passage says, “Up to now in metaphysics we still have not had anything satisfactory, for all systems can be shaken.’ (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, et. p. 127).

Kant said that Hume “aroused me from a dogmatic slumber” (*Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, 1783). However, in his lecture’s notes called *Metaphysik Mrongovius* (1782-1783) we have an interesting and perhaps a more candid remark about Hume from almost the same year. Kant said,

“Something similar to a critique of pure reason was found with David Hume, but he sank into the wildest and most inconsolable speculation over this, and that happened easily because he did not study reason completely, but rather only this or that concept. An investigation of practices (*facti*), how we arrive at cognition, where from experience or though pure reason. Locke accomplished much here…” (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, et. p. 137).

An interesting point, again we have the praise of the empiricist Locke and rather critical and almost sarcastic remarks about Hume. Kant is saying rather decisively that Hume’s philosophy looked at “only this or that concept”. This is Kant’s
position on the overall consequence of Hume’s philosophical skepticism to Kant’s project of transcendental and critical idealism (“my transcendental, or, better, critical idealism” (*Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, 1783). Kant’s critical idealism points away from Humean skepticism. Kant does have unbounded trust in reason and the pervasiveness of these criticism of Hume suggest strongly that Kant’s rationalism was the foundation of his project.

Kant’s transcendental philosophy (idealism) can be seen as providing the ontology of rationalism (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, et. p. 307). Kant said that “Transcendental philosophy is also called ontology, and it is the product of the critique of pure reason.” (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, et. p. 421). The concept of “critique” means an outline (Vorriss) of pure reason. A critique looks at the sources and boundaries (Quellen und Grenzen) (CPR, A11), at the architectonic, at the sources of pure reason and hence, a “critique” is the method but reason is the content. Reason and rationalism are indeed the touchstone of the Kantian project.

**Conclusion on Kant’s Metahistory of Philosophy**

A final note on one of Kant’s genuine and interesting position.

How should it be possible to learn philosophy anyway? Every philosophical thinker builds is own work, so to be speak, on someone’s else’s ruins, but no work has ever come to be that was to be lasting in all its parts. Hence, one cannot learn philosophy, then, just because it is not yet given. But even granted that there a philosophy actually at hand, no one who learned it would be able to say he was a philosopher, for subjectively his cognitions of it would always be only historical. (*Lectures on Logic*, et. p. 538).

Again, we have the metaphor of being among the ‘ruins’. The metaphysical systems are broken down blocks and ruins, which give us nothing to build on. But then Kant sinks in his final conclusion. Every system is only ‘historical’, even Kant’s system only gives us another part of the boundless sea. A philosopher must build his own system even though it is somehow on parts of ‘ruins’. We can learn Kant’s system, but that does not mean we are philosophers. In the middle of this remark by Kant, we see the function of the “But even granted”, so he might grant you can have a philosophical system, but in fact, this does you no good, since you
have this system only ‘subjectively’ and ‘historically’. Crucial philosophical point for Kant.

Kant does see a course and development to the history of philosophy. Kant has a Metahistory of philosophy that can be seen through an analysis of his works. However, Kant did not develop his thinking in any systematically or comprehensive way. This topic is still left open in the Kantian system; however, we can try to fill the gap by an assessment of Kant’s writings, but the purists may insist on a more philological reading. Back to Kant’s project.

To summarize Kant’s Metahistory of Philosophy:

1) From the transcendental point of view, there many edifices, but only ruins remain.

2) Metaphysics as philosophy is a boundless sea and progress has left no trace.

3) Metaphysics as philosophy has been a swinging back forth between trust in reason and mistrust in reason.

4) This history of philosophy or Metahistory of philosophy is made of overthrown system and all philosophical systems are shaken and broken.

5) Philosophical systems can only be known ‘subjectively’ and ‘historically’. Does Kant really mean this? What are the implications?

Conclusion.

How did some group of Neo-Kantians come to see Kant’s main metaphysical project as epistemology (Erkenntnistheorie) or even logic of cognition (Erkenntnislogik)? All readings of Kant are done with the given background of the Neo-Kantians. How after 220+ years or more to attempt to read Kant afresh? A difficult philosophical task. The misreading is common. However, after the first reviews of the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant knew there would be conflicting readings of his writings. The Garve-Feder review of 1783 alleged Kant was a close follower of George Berkeley (1685-1753). Kant of course makes remarks against Berkeley (AK 4:293). Indeed, Kant did write for his readers (contra
Nietzsche) and he made significant updates to the first edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) in the famous 2nd edition of 1787. For example, the B-Deduction (§15–20), and in the “Refutation of Idealism” (B274–279), both have given arise to a large body of contemporary scholarship. In responding to reviews, Kant wrote about the problems of reading of the *Critique of Pure Reason* in 1783, “But with regard to a certain obscurity – arising in part from the expansiveness of the plan…in this respect the complaint is just; and I will redress it through the present Prolegomena.” (*Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science* (Wissenschaft) et p. 58 AK 4:261. 1783). In the not so famous rough notes for the Prolegomena, 1783 (AK 23:53-65), Kant makes specific remarks about the Garve-Feder review [Johann Georg Heinrich Feder (1740-1821)]. Clearly, the review helped pushed Kant’s decision to move forward with publishing a work like the *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science*. Of course, this led to more problems for Kant as some of his inconsistent were immediately seen by his contemporaries.

In Kant’s reading and understanding of metaphysics in general and as a science; he found metaphysics lacking and he conclude that the time for dogmatic metaphysics was over. Kant wanted a rebirth or a reform (AK 4:257) of metaphysics after the implementation of a critique (this eventually led to three critiques) and the completion of his transcendental philosophy (or critical idealism, *Prolegomena* AK 4: 294). Even as early as 1773, this plan was going to be a metaphysic of nature and morals. Although Heidegger makes use of Kant’s original term ‘ontotheologie’, it is not clear that Kant’s major thrust has either an essential component of logic or theology. Theology is on part of Kant’s metaphysical diagram of 1776-1778; but, nevertheless, it is not one of the major components nor is it particularly highly ranked in his metaphysical system in general. Logic is not specifically list – although Kant knew logic well and lectured a total of 56 times on logic, which was most of his academic career (according to Steve Naragon).

By the year 1790, when Kant (aged 66) was contemplating once again creating the system, “I long as live up to the project (Vorhabens), complete establishment (aufzustellen) of a metaphysics in a coherent system “(“ich so lange lebe, um wie ich Vorhabens bin, die Metaphysik in einem zusammenhängenden Systeme aufzustellen.” AK 11:186). Unfortunately, Kant was able to elucidate and clarify the foundations; but in fact, he never made it to his final goal – namely, a coherent
system of metaphysics of nature and morals based on a critique and finally, a methodology that combines the theoretical and practical philosophy (AK 11:186). The overall project was first the investigation of the metaphysics of metaphysics. Next, a new wholly other science (critiques) was needed; and Kant then wants to proceed to new kind of metaphysics. This is not an old dogmatic metaphysics, but rather, now the proper and suitable methodology is a critical-metaphysics. Kant only gave us hints on what kind of metaphysics and philosophical system this was going to be in the future. In the letters, he gave some general outlines (for example, To Ludwig Heinrich Jakob September 11(?), 1787. (AK 10:494-495); but I do not take these as his real vision going forward. One considerable open question is what was Kant’s overall intent and locus with his philosophical project – was it in one word: “morality”? Did the postulates of practical reason lead to God and religion? Is Kant basically a religious thinker? How much of Kant’s inner intentions were in his later publication of Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason, “Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft” (1793, AK. 6:1-202)? Or, indeed was Kant primarily a metaphysician?

As Kant famously remarks, the value of metaphysics for the human race is either: everything (or all (Alles), or it means nothing (AK 20:259. 1793); and note that Kant’s significant remark toward the end of his major work, where he says, “metaphysics is culmination of all culture of human reason” (menschlichen Vernunft) in the Critique of Pure Reason (A851/B879. A-edition 1781, B-edition 2nd edition 1787. B879, AK 3:549). For Kant’s vision this not a minor or a simple part of what was his overall project of “metaphysic”. There is neither mysticism nor dogmatism in Kant’s project; Kant was a metaphysician, he wanted to radical change the nature of the methodology (‘proper method’) for a metaphysical system of nature and morals. In conclusion: tragically, Kant never got to his final goal. Fichte and Schelling were deeply involved in working through Kant to get to a practical philosophy. Only Hegel completely overcame Kant and busted through to a new system.

(1). Steve Naragon.  
http://www.manchester.edu/kant/ 

**Metaphysics of Nature and Morals**

*Metaphysica*

- General (*generalis*):
  - Reason and its concepts
  - themselves constitute the object.

- Special (*specialis*):
  - applied to different objects
  - by reason.

Transcendental philosophy.

- Critique of pure reason
- Ontology
- Experience
- The world itself and
  - in the world
  - ideas outside it.

*physiologia rationalis*

- immanent
- transcendental

- *Physica rationalis*
- *Psychologia rationalis*
- *Cosmologia*
- *Theologia*

(g Methods: dogmatic or critical (physiologically: Locke)
g to the last either: as we come to the principles and concepts
or, what they contain, and: how are they are possible).

(§ Metaphysik der Natur und Sitten.)

1  
4  
1 (§ *Generalis*)  
5  
1 allgemeine:  
6  
1 auf die  
7 Vernunft und
  
  
  
  
  ih\[\text{e}]]\[\text{r}\] Begriffe
machen selbst Obiecte angewandt.

das obiect aus.

(\(g\) Transcendental-Philosophie)

Critik Ontologie (\(g\) in der Welt.) (\(g\) Welt selbst und ausser ihr)

reine Den Erfahrung Ideen

Vernunft (\(g\) physiologia rationalis (\(g\) transcendent)
immanent)

Physica Psychologia Cosmologia Theologia rationalis rationalis ia ia

(\(g\) Methode: dogmatisch oder Critisch. (\(g\) Physiologisch: Locke.)

(\(g\) zur letzten entweder: wie wir zu den principien und Begriffen

Gelangen, oder: was sie enthalten, und: wie sie möglich sind.)

Books and notes:

Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten’s *Metaphysica*, 4th ed. (Latin. Halle: 1757). Note there were 7 editions published between 1739 and 1779. Baumgarten (1714-1762) first section below. Kant must have read and followed this text (Kant used the original Latin version) many times as he taught and gave metaphysics:

PROLEGOMENA METAPHYSICORUM:

§1 “Metaphysics is the science of the first principles in human cognition.”

[METAPHYSICA est scientia primorum in humana cognitione principiorum.]
§2. To metaphysics belong ontology, cosmology, psychology, and natural theology.
[Ad metaphysicam referuntur ontologia, cosmologia, psychologia, et theologiam naturalis.]

§4. ONTOLOGY (ontosophia, metaphysics (cf. §1), universal metaphysics, architectonics, first philosophy) is the science of the more general predicates of a being.
[ONTOLOGIA*) (ontosophia, metaphysica, cf. §. 1, metaphysica universalis, architectonica, philosophia prima,) est scientia praedicatorum entis generaliorum.]

§5. The more general predicates of a being are the first principles of human cognition; therefore, ontology is rightly assigned (§2) to metaphysics (§1, 4) [Entis praedicata generaliora sunt prima cognitionis humanae principia, ergo ontologia refertur, §. 2, cum ratione ad metaphysicam, §. 1, 4.]

See the entire Latin version (4th edition of 1757) that Kant used is online here: http://www.korpora.org/Kant/agb-metaphysica/auditor-benevolo.html

Note: Georg Friedrich Meier (1718-1777) translated the Baumgarten’s Latin version of the Metaphysics into German in (Halle: Carl Hermann Hemmerde) 1783.

Immanuel Kant. Anthropology, history, and education. Cambridge University Press, 2007. Kant’s own footnote, [h] “Seasickness (which I myself experience on a voyage from Pillau to Königsberg if indeed one wants to call this a sea voyage) …” (et p. 280, Section #29). (AK 7:169). Kant wrote in German the following footnote, “die Seekrankheit (von welcher ich selbst in einer Fahrt von Pillau nach Königsberg eine Erfahrung gemacht habe, wenn man anders dieselbe eine Seefahrt nennen will)”. (AK 7:169).


See also Steve Naragon web site.
Kant’s’ Writings

Not complete.


April 1755. *Brief Outline of Certain Meditations on Fire* (Meditationum quarundam de igne succinta delineation.

September 1755. *A New Elucidation of the First Principles of Metaphysical Cognition* (Principiorum primorum cognitionis metaphysicae nova dilucidatio.

1756. Use in Natural Philosophy of Metaphysics Combined with Geometry, Part I: Physical Monadology (Metaphysicae cum geometrica iunctae usus in philosophin naturali, cuius specimen I. continet monadologiam physicam.

1762. *False Subtlety of the Four Syllogistic Figures* (Die falsche Spitzfindigkeit der vier syllogistischen Figuren).


1763. *Attempt to Introduce the Concept of Negative Magnitudes into Philosophy* (Versuch den Begriff der negativen Größen in die Weltweisheit einzuführen).


1764. *Inquiry Concerning the Distinctness of the Principles of Natural Theology and Morality* (the Prize Essay) (Untersuchungen über die Deutlichkeit der Grundsätze der natürlichen Theologie und der Moral)
1766. Dreams of a Spirit-Seeer (Träume eines Geistersehers).


August 1770. Form and Principles of the Sensible and the Intelligible World (De mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principiis.

1775. On the Different Races of Man (Über die verschiedenen Rassen der Menschen).

1781. Critique of Pure Reason, 1 ed. First Critique. Kritik der reinen Vernunft. [A-edition (AA 4: 5-252); B-edition (AA 3: 2-552)]. Kant’s own personal marginalia is recorded at AK 23:17-50. The actual book was lost before 1945. Kant’s bound copy of his most famous book arrives for Kant’s breakfast July 22, 1781 (M. Kuehn). Kant was living in apartment on Ochsenmarkt (later called Lindenstraße (Steve Naragon), Königsberg, which was the capital of the Kingdom of Prussia at that time. Now the city is called Kaliningrad and it is in the Russian Federation. This book is called Kant’s first Critique (two more Critiques were written).


1783. Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics (Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik)

1784. Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment? (Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?).

1784. Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose (Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht).

1785. Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals (Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten).

1786. Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science (Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft).
1786. What does it mean to orient oneself in thinking? (Was heißt: sich im Denken orientieren?).

1786. Conjectural Beginning of Human History (Mutmaßlicher Anfang der Menschengeschichte).


1793. Unpublished during Kant’s life time. His most important unpublished theoretical writing: What Real Progress Has Metaphysics Made in Germany since the Time of Leibniz and Wolff (Welches sind die wirklichen Fortschritte, die die Metaphysik seit Leibnitzens und Wolf’s Zeiten in Deutschland gemacht hat?). Published in 1804. [AA 20: 257-332].

1795. *Toward Eternal Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (Zum ewigen Frieden *Ein philosophischer Entwurf*). (Königsberg: Friedrich Nicolovius, 1795), and then 2nd expanded edition (Königsberg: Nicolovius, 1796), 112 pp. [AA 8: 343-86].


1798. *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View (Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht).* [AA 7: 119-333].

1798. *The Contest of Faculties (Der Streit der Fakultäten).* [AA 7: 5-116].


More details see Steve Naragon’s KANT IN THE CLASSROOM web site. Excellent scholarship.
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Additional publications by Daniel Fidel Ferrer.


Umlaut and Greek words first.

Älteste, 6, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 33
älteste, 8, 17, 26, 27, 30, 33
Ältesten, 28, 29, 30, 31
ältestes, 14, 17, 29
ältesten, 14, 17, 29
ältestem, 28
ästhetisch, 35
ästhetischen, 35
ästhetischer, 35
über, 10, 16, 29, 30, 42, 44, 47, 86, 87, 88, 89
überall, 26
übereinkommen, 26
überhaupt, 16, 17
überleben, 34
Überlegungen, 28
Übersinnlichen, 55
überzeugt, 34
übrigen, 34
αρχη, 65
γὰρ, 5
dοκεί, 62
cωθ, 5
καθόλου, 5
καὶ, 5, 41, 45
λέγει, 5
μὲν, 5
μᾶλλον, 5
ποίησις, 5
Πᾶ, 45
Πάν, 41
συνεκδοχή, 50
tά, 5, 60
φιλοσοφήτου, 5
φυσικά, 60
ἀγνωστος, 62
ἐξήγησις, 7
ἐπιστήμη, 62
ἐνίν, 5
Ἐν, 41, 45
ἐκατέστην, 5
ἱστορία, 5
ἱστορίας, 5

Letter A start:

AA, 10, 55, 87, 88, 89
Aachen, 31
ab, 26
abbreviation, 45
Abel, 16
Aber, 19
aber, 26, 34, 88
Abh, 30
Abhandlung, 17
Able, 57, 58, 80
able, 37, 41, 58, 67, 68, 78, 80
About, 15, 76, 88
about, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 41, 42, 45, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 60, 62, 63, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 80, 88
above, 18
Abraham, 69
Abridged, 76
absolutely, 22, 60
Academic, 14, 17, 22, 34
Absicht, 60, 87
absolut, 33
Absolutes, 14, 17, 22, 34
absolutely, 22, 60
abstract, 53, 56
academic, 51, 67, 80
Academy, 59
Académie, 59
Academy, 59
Academie, 59
Accord, 22, 37
Accounting, 8, 52
account, 4, 26, 36
Access, 36, 81, 84, 93
accomplished, 77
agreed, 84
agreement, 43
aim, 60, 69
Aims, 40
Air, 13
Aix, 55, 71
Albany, 17, 48
Alber, 28, 29
Albertus, 52, 64
Alemán, 29
Alexander, 10, 25, 39, 67, 74, 83
alive, 53
All, 2, 8, 10, 16, 41, 42, 45, 46, 63, 72, 76, 79, 88
Admixture, 67
Adolf, 70
advance, 60
advanced, 74
Advancement, 43
advancing, 60
Advertiser, 41
advocating, 60
Aenesidemus, 39, 74
Aesthetic, 10, 16
aesthetic, 6, 11, 23, 65
Aesthetica, 66
Aesthetics, 29
aesthetics, 66
affairs, 61
affection, 42, 45
affinity, 7
affirmed, 44
afresh, 79
After, 14, 68
Afterglaubens, 22, 34
afterwards, 20
Again, 28, 69, 78
again, 6, 11, 22, 23, 57, 62, 64, 65, 68, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80
Against, 38, 89
against, 14, 37, 38, 41, 43, 44, 48, 63, 79
agb, 84
age, 3, 9, 12, 20, 41, 48, 53, 63, 64, 68, 69
aged, 80
agenda, 75
ages, 11, 22, 48
agitation, 11
agnōsis, 62
agree, 8, 52, 54, 74
agreement, 43
AkaDEMIE, 28, 30, 31
Akt, 34
akademie, 59
AK, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 87
Aktion, 28, 30, 31
Aktion, 34
all, 6
Alden, 70
advancement, 60
Ad Ceteram, 43
advancing, 60
Aedification, 87
Aeadicitia, 66
Aesthetic, 10, 16
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Berger, 30
Bering, 67
Berkeley, 76, 77, 79
Berlin, 6, 10, 15, 26, 27, 31, 42, 47, 48, 59, 73, 76, 82
Berliner, 42, 45, 55
Berlinerische, 44, 88, 89
Bern, 8, 11, 12, 20
Berliner, 42, 45, 55
Beschaffen, 33
Beschuldigung, 48
beschwören, 26
besides, 12
besitzen, 34
besondere, 82
best, 37, 45, 63, 64
Bestimmung, 48
Bestände, 31
Bethesda, 15
Betreiben, 26
better, 2, 9, 11, 53, 78
Between, 11, 48
Between, 3, 7, 15, 21, 23, 28, 37, 52, 60, 63
Beziehung, 47, 89
Bible, 2
Biblical, 14
bibliographical, 12
Bibliography, 4, 26
Bibliothek, 31, 41
Biester, 39, 43
bill, 70
bills, 9
bin, 34, 44, 80
Biography, 55
biography, 85
Bioética, 31
Birth, 3
birth, 3, 38, 42
bis, 34
Bishop, 76
bit, 11
bj, 36
Bl, 55
Blackwell, 28
bless, 18
blessed, 46
Blick, 35
blind, 23, 42, 76
blinde, 35
blocks, 57, 61, 73, 78
Blomberg, 76
blossen, 73
blößen, 45, 81, 88
bobbing, 61
body, 42, 80
Boehm, 25
bogged, 56
Bohemia, 6
boiling, 46
Bojantic, 28
bold, 52, 56
book, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 21, 24, 42, 45, 48, 53, 54, 57, 64, 65, 66, 69, 74, 87
Bookdealers, 88
Books, 27, 83, 89
books, 8, 10, 12, 37, 76, 92
Boris, 25
born, 3
botanic, 15
Botanische, 15
botany, 6
both, 10, 19, 37, 51, 63, 80
Bound, 41
bound, 85, 87
Boundaries, 45, 81
boundaries, 58, 62, 73, 78
boundless, 59, 74, 75, 78, 79
Bounds, 65, 73, 88
bow, 44
Bowie, 29
Bowman, 91
Bradley, 3
brain, 52
branches, 19
Brandis, 31
brash, 11
breakfast, 41, 85, 87
Brieve, 17, 32, 43, 89
Briefen, 10, 16, 26, 42
briefliche, 19
Briefwechsel, 20, 26, 64
bring, 67
bringing, 20
British, 52
broad, 7
Brockhaus, 20
broke, 57, 78, 79
brothers, 20
brought, 51, 54, 74
Bruch, 29
Brunswick, 41
brüderlich, 26
Brühl, 19
Bubner, 28
Buchhändler, 88
Buchmacher, 89
Buchstabenphilosophen, 11, 23, 34
build, 57, 61, 72, 73, 78
building, 37, 56, 72, 73
builds, 61, 78
busted, 81
busy, 17, 63
But, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, 25, 38, 42, 43, 53, 58, 59, 60, 64, 69, 73, 74, 75, 78, 80, 88
but, 2, 7, 18, 20, 22, 23, 33, 37, 45, 46, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 71, 72, 73, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81
Bxii, 60
Bxii, 71
BY, 2
By, 1, 2, 28, 31, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 61, 80, 92, 93
by, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 26, 27, 33, 38, 40, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93
Bände, 35
Böhlendorff, 9
Bohm, 28
Böse, 88
Cai, 28
call, 7, 51, 84
Called, 28
called, 7, 9, 11, 12, 18, 20, 22, 41, 42, 48, 50, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 78, 87, 89
calling, 7, 76
calls, 62, 73
Cambridge, 17, 84, 85, 90, 91
came, 10, 54, 76, 87
Can, 63
can, 2, 7, 18, 19, 22, 30, 37, 38, 43, 45, 50, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 66, 73, 75, 77, 78, 79
candid, 77
cannot, 11, 23, 37, 48, 60, 63, 64, 78
canton, 11
capable, 65
capacity, 15, 75
capital, 41, 42, 45, 87
Captain, 8
career, 52, 68, 80
careful, 64
carefully, 11, 38
Carl, 84
carried, 66
carries, 18
carry, 23
Carsten, 3
Carteius, 76
case, 10, 61, 65, 76
Casimir, 9
casting, 56, 71
Carteius, 76
case, 10, 61, 65, 76
Casimir, 9
casting, 56, 71
Cataloguing, 2
catch, 65
categories, 68
category, 66
caught, 42, 53
cause, 43
caussee, 18
carrier, 23
Carsten, 3
Carteius, 76
case, 10, 61, 65, 76
Casimir, 9
casting, 56, 71
Cataloguing, 2
catch, 65
categories, 68
category, 66
caught, 42, 53
cause, 43
causadd, 42
cavalier, 11
CBO, 90, 91
CC, 2
Center, 31
centers, 9
central, 50
Centro, 29
century, 2
Cerf, 48
Certain, 86
certain, 64, 80
Certainly, 54
certainly, 54
certainty, 19
cf, 84
chain, 57, 77
change, 2, 47, 81
changed, 59, 65
changes, 59, 74
Chapter, 70
chapter, 56, 71, 72
chapters, 8, 53, 54
characteristics, 37
Cher, 9
Chicago, 84
chief, 70
children, 3, 11
chimerical, 64
China, 87
Chr, 28
Christentums, 8
Christian, 14, 16, 32, 39, 43, 45, 57, 67, 70, 71
Christine, 3
christlichen, 8
Christoph, 6, 10, 12, 16, 19, 26, 27, 29
chronological, 54
CHRONOLOGIE, 31
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