Hegel's *Phenomenology* And Postmodern Thought[1]

© James Doull
fdoull@gmail.com

Introduction

{MS-4} The *Phenomenology of Spirit* is an introduction to the *Science of Logic* and the other parts of the system one calls the Hegelian philosophy. It is introductory in that it [brings to light][2] the subjective principle of the older modern philosophy, wherein what is other than self-consciousness is related to it, through a reflective logic, as forms of consciousness. This [reflective] relation [constitutes] the 'appearance' of spirit: a creative thinking which, through the rational creature, knows its creation as itself. When all forms of this relation - subjective, objective or historical, the conjunction of the two in religion - are considered in their development and succession, this apparent spirit is found to rest on spirit explicated in its own logical [or philosophical] form as spirit, not [simply] as for a subject. But the *Phenomenology* does not lead to the [philosophical] form of spirit as though it were not yet itself philosophy. [Rather], it is 'introductory' as comprehensive of, and pointing beyond, what is called 'modern' in distinction from 'ancient' philosophy. In ancient philosophy, though the concept of spirit occurs in its final systematic form as

---

[1] *Editorial note:* In the months preceding his death in March, 2001, James Doull had been working on an article, intended for *Animus*, on the lesson of Hegelian phenomenology for an understanding of post-modern philosophical and political culture. The material is of a very preliminary, incomplete quality; rough drafts clearly not having had the benefit of editing, second review or rewriting on the part of the author. These have been numbered MS-1, MS-2, MS-3 and MS-4, but as there is considerable overlapping and repetition as to content, the ordering is arbitrary. I have therefore been forced to be inventive in meshing the four drafts in order to form a continuous argument, such as seems to me best to reflect what I already know of his mind on these matters through earlier conversation. Thus various segments and fragmentary paragraphs have been melded as seemed fitting, the source in each case being appropriately prefixed. Where arguments are repeated, an alternative reading is footnoted in quotation marks. Instances of sheer repetition or fragmentary remarks which break off have been purged. With those exceptions, virtually all the extant script is included and nothing of my own interjected, although a degree of editorial tinkering was unavoidable in order to render certain sentences complete or their meaning more obvious. I have to this end added punctuation and inserted occasional words or phrases in square brackets. Where I had doubts, JD's unadulterated script is footnoted. All other footnoted comments are my own, as are the section titles -- *F. L. Jackson* . ..

[2] MS: "shows"

Neoplatonism, there is only the beginning of spirit at the point where all things are returned to their [original unity].[3]

Philosophy has its origin temporally in art and religion, so far as these are the forms of a people's knowledge of a concrete ethical freedom. In its three forms,[4] philosophy unites art and [religion], showing both to be necessary. Within philosophy itself, the difference [between] the immediate unity of image and thought in art, and their reflected relation in the *Vorstellung* of [religious] thought, assumes the form of a [self-differentiation][5] of logical stages by which [thinking] comes to know its object as itself. The first [or ancient] philosophy which took its beginning in art presupposed a universal principle and came to know what that was through [a thinking through of] nature. The second, [modern] or phenomenological philosophy, presupposed nature, this presupposition mediated with the universal through the [thinking] subject. In the third the mediation is in God or the universal [itself]. This last philosophy gives adequate form to what is believed in the Christian religion and is the true *intellectus fidei*; [a thinking] neither extraneous [to its content] nor mediated [only] through the subject, as in the Augustinianism become modern philosophy.[6]

The *Phenomenology of Spirit* is a comprehension of modern philosophy in its development of the subject as certain of itself to the truth of that certainty, and the concomitant development of a 'free society'.[7] Following the method given in the introduction of the work, a reader thus oriented can discover the unity and [deliberate][8] movement of the work according to Hegel's intention, though [it is a standpoint] hard to attain for those nurtured in the presuppositions of a later age. That philosophy is a form

---

[3] MS: "their origin".

[4] . JD's argument wholly assumes Hegel's account of the consummation of modern philosophy in his time, with its consequent radical shift in thinking, the emergence of a 'third', 'post-modern' phase of philosophical history.

[5] MS: "difference".

[6] That philosophy generally shares in and arises out of the absolute perspective of art and religion is of course the central doctrine of 'absolute spirit', which describes the universal interest embodied in those speculative enterprises through which finite, self-consciousness human beings seek to appropriate, express and embody the infinity of freedom as their own essential actuality, their truth in and as "spirit". The systematic (i.e. logical) relation of art, religion and philosophy is given in *Encyc*. Part III, Section Three (and elsewhere), but the same triune relation is reflected, not only in philosophy itself in its constituent idea, but also in the historical 'appearances' of philosophy as described in *Encyc*. Ss. 574-577. There the 'syllogisms' which describe the essential thrust of the ancient (ss.575) and the modern (ss.576) philosophies culminate in a third syllogism which defines the standpoint of a new philosophical thinking aborning in Hegel's time -- a thinking which freely and explicitly commences from none other than the principle of spirit as such, as the 'idea' implicit in and informing all philosophy. The Hegelian system gives the broad logical outline of this third phase of philosophical history.

[7] The role of the *Phenomenology* is central since it was explicitly intended by Hegel as the logical recapitulation of the standpoint of the finite or subjective spirit and the whole Christian and later modern-philosophical culture resting on it; as comprehended from the point of view of its perceived consummation in Hegel's time. It thus at once forms the appropriate 'introduction' to a new and distinctively post-modern standpoint. JD's interest herein is not directed so much to the internal argument of the *Phenomenology* itself, as to the overall view of history it presupposes on the one hand, and on the other, what the transition to a 'third' post-modern, post-Christian culture of which Hegel writes has subsequently come to mean. For further, see James Doull, "What is the Augustinian 'Sapientia'?", *Dionysius* 12 (1988) 61-67.

[8] MS: "unfailing".

of 'absolute spirit', what 'spirit' as absolute or finite is, what philosophy has to do with art and religion - all this is long forgotten.

Though words may differ, to say that philosophy is a form of 'absolute spirit' is in no way an eccentric opinion but that of all philosophers before Hegel, though they might stumble like men drunk[9] and only after a certain development come to know explicitly what they were about. What distinguishes philosophy since the post-Hegelian revolution is tihe conviction that [the new] humanized philosophy and culture generally have not lost but taken [wholly up into] themselves, as their own, everything that had before been ascribed to religion and metaphysics, to the [alleged] detriment of human freedom. 'Post-Christian' is not said merely of ways of thought antagonistic to Christianity - animism, enlightenment [or] whatever - but to [the general belief that] humanity, as having absorbed Christianity, [is] able on its own to realize a freedom to which religion had come to be only an impediment and a delusion. The formation of this attitude is not to be explained as an 'overthrow' of philosophy as formerly understood. Those who first spoke of these changes and their successors rather found themselves [already] on the other side of a wall, and of former philosophy saw only what made sense from that position.

Hegel had not long departed this life when one learned from those who had heard him or were closely associated with his thought that religion was myth or that its proper theme was humanity; that philosophy was the guide to a wholly secular liberation, [a liberation] not least from religion and metaphysics [themselves]. If not many at first gave in explicitly to this radical humanization of philosophy, what was called philosophy in the nineteenth century culture after the 'thirties was [nonetheless] hardly less remote from the Hegelian concept of philosophy as a form of absolute spirit. Philosophers wavered between more naturalistic and more idealistic versions, losing hold of the dialectic that might have combined these opposed directions and [failing] to uncover a unity of the two without [obscuring] the difference.

The logic of this [post-Hegelian] transition to a humanized philosophy, the history of this philosophy as it sought to unify its divisions, and of the incipient return from it to older philosophies as of other than historical interest, has yet to be [fully] given. It may be thought that we are for now at a certain lull in the storm where post-Hegelian schools have lost their attraction and the passions which animated their discovery have subsided; where philosophy in any of the three forms Hegel knew only begins to return from a long oblivion.

Phenomenology And Philosophical History

{MS-1} The *Phenomenology of Spirit* , [as] an introduction to the *Science of Logic* and the other parts of the Hegelian system, does not lead everyone to the system, whatever presuppositions one may hold as to how, if at all, 'spirit' can be known

---

[9] The simile is Aristotle's. Anaxagoras in bringing presocratic metaphysics to completion in the idea of *nous*, is spoken of as."a sober man among drunkards".

philosophically.[10] What 'spirit' means is taken to be known through the Christian religion: the triune God in himself, the creation of irrational nature and of the rational creature, implicitly spiritual, the division or 'fall' of the rational creature, the revelation of what God is in the incarnation, death and resurrection of the Son, the conversion thereby of the division into a moment of concrete spiritual form unifying God and the human individual. That this belief -- expressed in a thinking which used natural relations for what was beyond them -- could be known as true also for thought, had long been the interest of philosophical Christians; a necessary interest since, for other than philosophical thought, the *Vorstellung*[11] was incredible.

Philosophy is for Hegel a form of 'absolute spirit' and the highest. It is only to be treated after art and religion, being in a manner a unity of the two. That is a hard saying and differs from what since his time one has commonly taken philosophy to be - as the most general of the sciences, perhaps, [having] something more to say of the embodied self-consciousness which is man than psychology and the life sciences or something further than the social sciences about human communal relations; [or which perhaps], as logic, can speak of the common form of all inquiries. The unity of mind and body, which man is, is not grasped as 'free spirit', nor history as the common realization of that freedom. Absolute spirit, as that in which historical reality and subjective freedom are united, which the individual comes to as the knowledge of his freedom, "has its reality in spirit", and not in the recurrent evils and precarious goods of historical existence - 'absolute spirit' [in that sense] appears [to a later time] as a vain notion, an escape, perhaps an opiate.

But all peoples have their arts in which they realize beauty - the ugly as well, if the world is for them ugly -- and some religion in which they have relations to divine beings potent to realize or frustrate human ends. [But if] all peoples have arts and religions, few peoples have discovered philosophy in Hegel's sense. Philosophy as separate from art and religion, unmixed with myth and image, came into being first among the ancient Greeks. The ground was prepared for that philosophy by the political freedom of the *polis* - not an abstract subjective freedom, but an ethical freedom in which individuals knew themselves free in realizing the concrete objective ends of family and state. To this freedom poets and other artists gave a universal foundation -- a religion in the medium of art, nature and freedom harmonized, the harmony not broken by the emergence of the rational individual or person from the domestic and the political community.

It is the emergence of subjective freedom from the collision of natural and political institutions, the formation of an actual relation of individual and universal within which falls [also] their difference, that permits the appearance of philosophy. In the aesthetic

---

[10] On the essential project of the *Phenomenology* as 'introductory' to the system see: James Doull, "Review of Emil Fackenheim's *The Religious Dimension in Hegel's Thought*", *Dialogue*, (1969) 483-91, and (With Emil Fackenheim) "Would Hegel be a Hegelain Today?", *Dialogue*, (1970) 222-235.

[11] Here and in what follows, reference to 'the *Vorstellung*' is JD's (as Hegel's) shorthand for the specifically Christian representational schema, forming the unique content of its general belief as articulated in the doctrines mentioned. 'Spirit' might also be said somewhat to belong to the class of quasi-natural representations (Holy Spirit, the Comforter etc.); the corresponding philosophical concept addressed more in terms of the idea of an unconditionally actual freedom.

mode both tragic and comic poetry verge on this unified thought, but one on the side of the universal, the other on that of the individual. Philosophy is from the first a free universal thinking which would know all else through forms of itself - concepts or - and these forms as leading to the highest which is "the thinking of thinking itself". Not that philosophy knew from the first [what] it was, as though it could [directly] appropriate the result of the self-knowledge attained in the aesthetic medium. Though in the order of experience philosophy was dependent on that aesthetic knowledge, once discovered, it had its independent growth, at first antagonistic to the anthropomorphizing images of the artists, then recognizing a common end more adequately known in the medium of thought.

After Aristotle, with whom this universal thought discovered what it was, interest turned to the relation of free individuals or persons to that objective end. This relation was sought first in the humanized world of Hellenistic-Roman culture which drew to it the peoples who did not know the individual freed == or repelled the Jewish people who in their religion knew the root of that freedom [only] in its pure universality. The free individuals of that culture, finding their independence to dissolve into sceptical instability, turned inward to discover that absolute principle in the several forms of Neoplatonism in which ancient philosophy reached its limit.

The limit of that philosophy was that in Neoplatonism the movement to the absolute principle was from the side of the free individual and not also from the principle, though that it should be this as well was contained in the Aristotelian idea of a self-creative thought. The [Neoplatonic] philosophy knew as the assumed end of its search the intuition of a unity before all division and difference. That philosophy might move from the negativity of this result and [come to] know [that] what was other than the principle [also pertains] to it, and to the free individual, required a new beginning. That beginning, if it would become the end and interest of all, could not exist first as philosophy. Nor could one revert to the aesthetic religion which was the birthplace of the ancient philosophy, since here the need was of the free individual, which had broken with the world to find a world in which its freedom had reality. The condition of such a further philosophy was the Christian religion in which God, knowing division as his own - God as trinitarian -- revealed what he was in the incarnation, death and resurrection of his Son; where[in] individuals were not only implicitly free through submission to their creator, as in Judaism, but as divided and in relation to the creation given over to their passions and finite interests and turned against the creator, were [yet] drawn by the Son from that division to the concrete freedom revealed in him. In this religion the Aristotelian principle, purged of the presupposed finitude through which philosophical thought had access to it by the negativity of the free individual and its self-knowledge in Neoplatonism, was known as realized in the spiritual relation of God and man in the medium of a thought expressed in language, available to those drawn in faith to the revelation as absolute truth without need of the hard intellectual formation requisite for philosophy.

[This] *intellectus fidei* had for its medium before the modern age ancient philosophy, especially in the final systematic form called Neoplatonism. [Whether] thought through

more Aristotelian or more Platonic versions of this philosophy, the concrete spirit of the religious belief neither appeared nor was known [in a thinking] equally concrete. [The Neoplatonic] philosophy led [only] to 'the One' before the division of thinking and thought - implicitly 'spirit', as the source of all things, but not to be spoken of unless in images. For a new philosophy to emerge from this religion it was necessary that the human world, receptive of it and informed by it, should attain the form of a concrete ethical order, where the interest of individuals was to realize objective institutional ends, unitive of nature and subjective freedom. This occurred historically in the reformation of the medieval church by which subjective freedom [came to be] known as a necessary moment in the reception of religious truth. The reflection of this reform on human institutions was to overthrow the medieval order in all its principal aspects: instead of a celibate ideal to give priority to family life; to set work for one's living above poverty [as] an abstract freedom from the temptations of economic life; to put in place of obedience a free acceptance of political power.

But in these transformed relations to the world, which rested on the relation of the individual in the religious community to his reconciliation as accomplished in Christ, there was not yet the free self-consciousness which would be the moving force in the modern age, alike in philosophy and in human life generally. The ancient philosophy, in the aesthetic *Sittlichkeit* in which it originated, did not have in it the free rational individual or person. In this second beginning[12] there was only implicitly the free subject, certain of its being and, in that certainty, of its capacity to know the divided or finite and to relate it to the human good. The course of philosophy in the modern age would develop the relation of that subject to the absolute substance, the God of religious faith, and to the radically externalized nature (implicitly the same as that self-conscious certainty), [and to develop these relations in] the concrete form they had in the religious *Vorstellung*. The principal interest of this philosophy Kant knew to be "God, freedom and immortality" -- that the subject was free also in its immediate embodied existence. Even [so], for the sceptical among the [modern] philosophers -- and scepticism is part of philosophy -- what philosophy could not know were these objects-in-general. The general history of that age was disturbed by revolutions which had the same direction as philosophy -- to develop subjective freedom. The popular will, which [initially] saw itself as constitutive of the state [and] as appropriating it, in the end found its true freedom in returning to the ethical order with which modernity began, only now as having subjective freedom in it.[13]

The [aim of] *Phenomenology* is to introduce the philosophy of the concrete spirit, of which it can be said it differs from the religious *Vorstellung*, not in content, but only in giving [that content a] conceptual form [appropriate] to a reader [who is] already in the philosophy of the modern age. This [modern] philosophy begins where the [ancient] philosophy ended - with the subject certain of itself, as beyond division and the

---

[12] I.e., the Reformation.

[13] In Hegel's reasoning, a 'return' always directly entails a new beginning, and one more concrete than the original since comprehensive of all that has intervened. The 'return' to the original Christian-modern principle is thus at once the emergence of a new *Sittlichkeit*, the post-modern culture in which Hegel already found himself and which is subsequently presupposed.

possibility of being deceived as to itself, a subject which finds as its principal idea an absolute substance [as] cause of its own existence. For this new beginning in philosophy the way to God or the absolute substance is not [as for the ancient] through nature and its reflection into an ideal world. [Having grasped] nature as unified, this [new] thinking radically distinguishes it from itself, and knows it as radically externalized. [In] this structure, the movement of thought [now] is, in the light of the divine substance, to find itself by going into the world, which, [though] separated from [the independence of thinking], is implicitly one with it. The objects of primary interest in this reconstitution of the former order are: the freedom of the subject; the laws or necessary connections through which the endless otherness of extended matter is intelligible; the relation of the free subject to itself as a living individual in nature; and God as comprehensive of nature and freedom.

The way to knowledge and the amelioration of human life in this context was by experience.[14] The interest of philosophy was to discover the method of experience, how one might not end in doubting all things but, [as a] free subject, to distinguish true from false. Philosophy not only discovered a method -- having which and adapting it to particular subject matters the sciences and technical arts might go their way oblivious to their foundations -- but [knew] itself, in relation to its universal interests, as a knowledge by experience. What was sought before by turning from the world to a divine truth was to be discovered now by turning to nature, not as a distant image of an intelligible world, but as the work of a divine creator, creative alike of the spatio-temporal conditions of nature [as] of its several orders constituted according to categories of necessity and causality.

[Whether] taken as constitutive of things or subjectively as 'categories' of the understanding, the free subject knew truly through these forms. But in the [subsequent] development of this philosophy of the freedom of the subject and the necessity of the understanding, the experience of 'spirit', which is the subject of the *Phenomenology,* was of the problems the free subject encountered in its knowledge of itself, of nature, and of God in the relation of self-consciousness to what was other than but also belonged to it. As against the older *intellectus fidei* there was here [the actual] experience -- or what is equivalent -- the appearance of spirit. The intuition[15] of unity before division had given way to a mediated knowledge comprehensive of division. But in this relation the moment of division and difference is unequal to [that of their unity], the mediation [being only] through the free subject. The movement of the subject is to overcome this inequality and expose the 'spirit' underlying its appearance.

---

[14] In Hegel's account, the whole of modern thought from Descartes to Kant is properly to be described as a reflection on God, the world and the self explicitly from the standpoint of the self-certain thinking subject (in Hegel's terms, the finitely existing, 'appearing' or phenomenal spirit). The ordinary term for this relation of a self-conscious being to all that appears to it as given, is simply 'experience'. Modern philosophy is thus uniquely 'philosophy of experience', which is why Hegel's titles his summary of it 'phenomenology' -- "the science of the experience of consciousness" (see *Phenomenology of Spirit,* concluding remarks of *Introduction*).

[15] Neoplatonic?

This mediation is first in the subject, its development to a concrete unity of individual and universal, in which the opposition in all its forms of self-consciousness and consciousness is comprehended. The unified individual has then to know the [realization] in objective or historical form of its freedom. Then the unity of these two developments is known through religion as the free relation of human and divine implicit in this unity [which is], through a succession of religions, attained in Christianity. The philosophy as such of phenomenological spirit is finally a reflection on the unfreedom remaining in the religious *Vorstellung*, which draws on the subjective and objective experience, the destruction and restoration of the religious relation in these forms, and through the concept of religion thus attained knows that unfreedom to belong to the form and not to the true content of the Christian religion. In this translation of *Vorstellung* to the form of thought the subjective mediation gives way to a mediation inherent in the divine idea, which is the standpoint of the Hegelian system.[16]

The third philosophy, to which Hegel first gave expression, has like the second the Christian religion as that in which it exists in the general consciousness. But the relation of the religious to the philosophical form of 'absolute spirit' is not the same. The second, in [disciplining][17] an abstract subjective spirit -- [otherwise] destructive of the Christian religion -- to the concrete content of the *Vorstellung*, gave to it a philosophical form. The third philosophy founds its relation to nature, and to finite spirit in [both] its subjective and objective aspects, [directly] on the Christian trinitarian idea, this as the [explicit] object of a thinking which, through the first and second philosophies, knows itself and its objects as concrete - as the division and return [to itself] of an original unity. The movement of this thought, as in the *Vorstellung*, is to a relation of equal 'persons' within which are contained all subjective and objective concepts.[18] On this foundation rests a *Sittlichkeit* in which 'life' or the immediate existence of spirit, and the relations of individuals in their particularity, are comprehended in a self-governing community wherein the unity of freedom and nature in family, society and state is equally the unfolding of an objective end, and, from the side of individuals, the realizing of that end as their concrete good.

---

[16] This short paragraph gives the briefest possible summary of the stages in the argument of *Phenomenology*, the upshot of which is the standpoint of the 'third' philosophy of the system.

[17] The MS has 'drawing back'.

[18] MS-4 has: "The third philosophy which began with Hegel had again its finite condition in an ethical order in which subjective and institutional freedom coincided. The mediation is through the religious *Vorstellung* -- the subjective assent to the objective operation of grace. Secularly the result is acquiescence in a divinely appointed political order. That this unity be for the subject and through its activity was, [in the practical sphere], the work of the revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The interest of these revolutions is to bring a subjective freedom into an institutional order [that is itself] implicitly free. This new order had its foundation neither in the 'religion of beauty' [of the ancients] nor in the Christian freedom of the Reformation, but in the Christian Trinitarian idea [as such] as the object of philosophical thought - the Hegelian idea. In this relation the war of Enlightenment with the Christian religion was ended. [True], the formation of individuals generally to a knowledge of their freedom was through that religion in its Protestant form, the meaning of the *Vorstellung* being allowed [therein] to prevail over its form. [But] in [the new] ethical order the inflexible religious basis of the family was no longer seen as in conflict with subjective freedom but as [the latter] objective end; [while] civil society no longer tended to replace the state, giving primacy to competing particular interests; [rather] sovereignty and the popular will were reconciled in the state."

{MS-4} What tribes and peoples take for their gods -- as beings capable of sustaining their communities and interests and imparting to individuals some sense of an independence from, or at least a coincidence with, the recurrent course of nature - to such beings mythopoeic fancy [has given] countless forms, personalized more or less superficially. [But] that the religion of a people and the expression of itself aesthetically should also take the form of philosophy supposes that its institutions are animated by a subjective freedom -- that individuals know the realization of their common ends as a realization also of [that] freedom. One can say with Aristotle that the tendency to philosophy is present in all men; [however], that this tendency develop into philosophy as such -- a thinking that [knows its] determinations as its own and not a thought mixed with myth and image -- this thinking must exist virtually in the relation of free individuals to their institutions. From the laborious freedom of political life philosophy could emerge as the science of the free man who knew the principle of that freedom.

Genesis Of Post-Modern Culture

{MS-2} *The Phenomenology of Spirit* is comprehensive of the subjective standpoint of modern philosophy. Its treatment of that philosophy is different from that of the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* as not looking back to that history from the new concept of philosophy which emerged from its argument, but, so to speak, from within it, following the development of the subjective principle itself. The infinite substance, existent from its intrinsic necessity, which the Cartesian subject found in itself as its primary idea, was for the [Hegelian] subject -- which not only found [a principle] of concrete freedom in itself but knew the objective development of that freedom -- no longer simply substance but also subject. The relation of human freedom to that infinite subjectivity was not that of Augustinian predestination, as in the Protestant Christianity with which the period began, but of a freedom realized also on the human side.

The new [or third] philosophy which this argument discovered had no longer the form of a subjective freedom reconciled with the world [only] in principle, by methodical exploration and ordering of the world finding itself in it but also divided from it. [It was no longer] the appearance or experience of spirit but spirit itself: nature as a moment of divine freedom; human freedom as a divided subjective and objective relation to that freedom; that division overcome where human and divine meet in the forms of absolute spirit.

The difference of this new philosophical standpoint from that of phenomenal spirit appears in all aspects of human life. In the primary human institutions there is no longer a contest between objective end and individual freedom. The relation of man and woman is no [longer] a medieval separation of ideal unity and abstract legality; nor is it a unity [that is] inward and implicit only, not extending to differences; [nor again a] relation realized in particular interests without inner unity. [In the new relation] inclination and reason meet, and its realization is through the [conforming][19] of nature to the *Sittlichkeit* of the

---

[19] MS: "formation".

family in children. [Moreover], the sphere of private interests is no longer a contest of 'estates' with one another and with a state in course of attaining an effective unity. The revolutions are past in which one sought to centre political sovereignty in 'society'. [If] 'society' [used to be] taken to be within the state, as states became more and more democratized, the rights of individuals and of national communities were assumed to be prior to all institutional relations. [Thus] in both family and in the interrelation of society and state there was at first a deepened spiritual unity, then a falling away from this unity to a priority of individuals in their diverse interests and natural particularity. [But] neither tendency can be grasped without the other and neither through the antecedent modern philosophy. The rights assumed to belong to individuals and national communities reflect an institutional order in which individuals, as capable of concrete freedom, are the primary end and interest.

In religion the new philosophy worked a like revolution. One is not to suppose that someone of perverse, aberrant genius invented the Hegelian philosophy in the face of common sense and national experience. Rather, as is the office of the philosopher, Hegel discerned and defined logically a universal shift in the self-understanding of peoples, touching all the principal objects of their interest. In religion the shift pertained to the relation [of peoples] to the primary doctrines of the Christian religion. The belief of the church had been given stable universal form in antiquity, accommodated to the Greco-Roman culture within which it had [its] historical existence. With peoples who had been converted to the Christian religion, not from that developed culture but from an undeveloped barbarous condition,[20] the need was to form in them that ordered, rational relation to their religion which otherwise must be a mixture of piety and destructive savagery in [their] relation to the world. Religious belief was both beyond this developing order and mediated by it, expressed through fasts, pilgrimages and other austerities, reverence to saints in whom faith was actual, [and] communicated [both] symbolically and through the discipline of works by a sacred clergy. [In this era] the philosophical understanding of the concrete spirituality of Trinity, Incarnation, Resurrection and the relation of the faithful to this belief was through the analogies of a finite reason [as applied to] a unity before [all] division and discourse. There was no place for the subjective principle of the modern age which radically combined intuition and discourse.

The modern age was founded on a spiritual relation to the spiritual content of the Christian religion; a relation in which substantial unity, division and subjective return to the origin are not dissipated, as in Neoplatonism, into a primal unity. [But], though the relation is now 'spiritual', it is only as the 'appearance' of spirit: subjectivity, while taken philosophically as the beginning, is extraneously mediated, relating itself to the substantial unity [of spirit itself] only through a dialectical reflection on the finite, in the course of which reflection it unifies its own divided moments and discloses the objective foundation of this reflection itself].[21]

---

[20] JD has in mind the Christianized Germanic peoples, the original European 'nations'.
[21] I have considerably rearranged the wording of this last sentence defining the essential 'phenomenality' of the modern spirit. The original MS has::"The relation is spiritual, but as apparent spirit, in that the subjective moment is either extraneously mediated or, taken philosophically as the beginning, has relation

This 'phenomenal' spirituality brought with it a radical shift in the understanding and practice of the Christian religion and its relation to a secular order.[22] In its religious form it took for its object the *Vorstellung* itself of the principal doctrines, not [its] translation into the concepts of the Neoplatonic synthesis of Aristotelian and Platonic thought. The intent [lay now], not in a virtuous reform of the will against the background of eternal damnation and purgatorial correction, but in the relation of individuals directly to their absolute restoration. Against the [purely inward] reconciliation in this relation, the subjective moment subordinated in it would on its own make that reconciliation explicit and real by [returning to][23] the world and in that relation maintaining a rational self-conscious unity. The phenomenal spirit of the modern age was [to become] occupied with the relation of religion, as so taken, and enlightened reason; the new beginning which Hegel discerned and delineated at a certain point in its development comprehended the terms of that division.

With that change the phenomenal spirit gave way to concrete spirit: the [mere] apprehension of the *Vorstellung* passed into agreement with its content. The result is still with us, but as externalized: the subject of the religious relation appears as the existing individual, or as a humanity capable of realizing beyond limit the finite freedom of all its members. When one speaks of a post-Christian or post-modern world what is meant is [just] this externalized spirit. The consequences for religion, as they have unfolded, are wonderful to consider. Where for Hegel, who had thought through [the whole career of the] phenomenal spirit the result was a knowledge of the constant belief of Christians in the unique truth of their religion -- as adequate to what [is assumed] in all religion, other religions as containing a partial truth, a *praeparatio evangelii* --, for the externalized standpoint, first, all religions are equal; second, the most primitive is preferable as abstracting least from human existence; third, the Christian religion is of all the most intolerable as most radically founded in thought. The result is a Christianity factualized, resting on a fundamentalism either of image and symbol or of scriptural text.

The confirmation of the Christian religion was for Hegel 'in spirit and in truth'; the historical contingencies of its first appearance, [its] later tradition and [subsequent] division of Christendom into complementary forms [having] had their truth in that [spiritual] relation. What separates Hegel from the forms which the new philosophical beginning he articulated assumed after his time, [is that] there has occurred a conflation of the historical development of Christian peoples in which the original meaning of the modern age has [itself] been lost from sight. In that conflation, Descartes and his successors appear to have conceived a dualism of mind and body, thought and nature. That their intent was rather to discover a unity such as was not before known is largely forgotten, as alien to a mentality which assumes that unity immediately. [The] history of

---

to the substantial unity through a dialectical reflection on the finite, which collects its divided moments into a unified relation and discloses an objective foundation of this reflection."

[22] The reference, one presumes, is to Protestantism.

[23] MS: "by giving into the world". Reference is to the Renaissance renewal of interest in nature and the human condition on the part of an individualism fully disciplined in the 'otherworldliness' of Christian spiritual inwardness. Having gained the confidence and certainty of their inner freedom thereby, it became possible to re-engage the finite world, without, as was the case with Roman individualism, succumbing to mysticism or scepticism.

this post-Christian, post-modern world has [since] run its course to the point of a scepticism which no longer knows whether philosophical thought is possible at all; whether there [could be] a free self-consciousness where mind is assimilated to body and their relation a mystery. In the practical realm, universal rights are ascribed to individuals as prior to all institutional relations; [but] what the universality [of right] and its articulation as a plurality [could mean] from this standpoint of the externalized spirit, is not intelligible. The meaning of rights and their application becomes in this context a matter of arbitrary and shifting judgment. Institutions as predicated on indeterminate rights lose their cohesion and capacity to unify divided opinions, the exercise of power tending therefore to be arbitrary and tyrannical.

The source of this dissolution and loss of coherent thought is perhaps most easily evident when one considers the origin and meaning of universal rights. The thoughtful historian knows that the 'universality' of the individual -- the rational individual or person capable of universal determination in relation to such others -- is a concept unknown before the Hellenistic-Roman age. The historian knows also that the more concrete 'rights of man and the citizen' in their various formulations are the product of the rational spirit of Enlightenment. The further extension of rights in modern democracies, including the rights of communities, draw their universality from the concrete spirit expressed in the Hegelian philosophy. Taken in abstraction from that history and the philosophies animating it, rights have the contradictory quality of equalizing all differences [while] at the same time requiring they be saved; or they appear as a leveling equality and also the immediate reaction to this [from the standpoint of] a being in nature.

Considered from the side of the Hegelian philosophy, 'post-modernity' is the concrete unity of nature and thought [as it appears] in the *Sittlichkeit* of family, society and state set forth in the *Philosophy of Right*. The [philosophical science][24] which [would] grasp the logical structure of post-modernity assumes the system, but in its practical aspect at that first stage of its development -- that unification of spirit in ethical institutions as completed in what Hegel calls the 'immediate state'. That [immediate] state is distinguished in the argument of the *Philosophy of Right* from the state as externalized, [i.e., 'civil society'],[25] as a state in which the natural particularity of a people has been united concretely with their common rational universality,[26] [existing thus] as a particular individual in relation to other such individual states.

---

[24] JD is tempted to call this inquiry 'phenomenology' in another, post-Hegelian sense. As I find this distinction obscures the main flow of the argument I have excluded it. The MS reads: "The philosophical science whose object is this appearance is a 'phenomenology of spirit', but in an altered sense from that of the work so named. That [latter] phenomenology is introductory to the new philosophy of the Hegelian system. The phenomenology which can grasp the logical structure of 'post-modernity' assumes the system, but in its practical aspect ... etc".

[25] See *PhR* 157B and 183.

[26] JD here is here describing, phenomenologically, the principle of the modern nation-state, in particular the European-Christian monarchies. The limit of the 'immediate' state lies in its existence as a distinct community, based as much on some naturalistic distinction of boundary, blood, language, lineage etc. as on a universal political principle. The universal grounds of political right in the Christian principle of freedom thus tend to be conflated with and degenerate into claims to nationhood on the part of particular self-identified peoples or *Volker*. It is this intrinsic inconsistency which makes inevitable the eventual mutual

That this state does not rest in its ideality (as Plato wished that the *polis* of his Laws remain as isolated as possible from the corrupting relation to other states) is to be understood through the logic of spirit which variously determines the development also of states which have not, [as it has], attained a concrete ethical unity. Spiritual unity is not [something] immediate, but a [self-subsistence] through division and externality and the negation of it. The externality of the 'immediate' state [consists in] its natural particularity,[27] and its movement is to unite [this its givenness] with its inner ideality. But the state as thus unified does not [then] have a spiritual form. The subjectivity attained in this unification -- which is the active or executive power in its constitution -- only becomes actual as the unity of the whole people when they forget this ideality and are given over to the multiple [internal] interests of partial communities -- e.g., economic and other corporations.

{MS-4} In the political system of the nineteenth century, whose dominant form is the nation state, the inner universality of the state is lost from sight in the [welter of] relations of one to another as particular wills. The instability and contradiction brought to light in these relations is the point of transition to absolute spirit as that on which they depend. This transition is found in some form or other in all human communities, however rudimentary the structure of their domestic, economic and political institutions. The structures through which individuals have common binding ends -- are 'communities' -- both liberate and confine or even enslave. So far as members of a community are awakened to a sense of their individual freedom, and [of] its confinement, they are impelled to 'liberate' themselves from their institutions, whether to remake them and find room for their awakened freedom or only to relapse into the same unfreedom. [28]

{MS-2} In post-modernity, as springing from the completed inner development of the European state, the division [into particular and ideal elements][29] also is complete, and appears able to stand on its own [independent of] the state [itself] and its religious foundations. If, however, one follow attentively the logical development of post-modernity [one witnesses] a dissolution of this confidence in its independence of earlier forms. Thus at first only a radical minority went fully over to this division and [its] utopian confidence in an ultimate human liberation, whether in a Marxist or Nietzchean form or some variation of these. People generally held to the sovereignty of their states, adhering to the abstract [or] moral aspect of that division or [else to its] natural extreme, or to some conflation of the two. Power in the states passed to a middle class and formally to a more and more inclusive democracy. The [European] states found an objective realization of their sovereignty in empires, subjecting peoples of less liberated cultures and providing for the enrichment of the middle class.

---

destruction of the European *Volksgeister*, as also the emergence of a universal *Weltgeist*, an historical dialectic which JD will point out below is the whole upshot and inspiration of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*.
[27] One takes "natural particularity' here to refer to those differences of locale, lineage, language etc wherein peoples distinguish themselves as 'nations'.
[28] For Hegel on this general point, see *Encyc*. ss. 482.
[29] The elements whose unification wholly on the side of finite humanity is the basis of the 'immediate state' as defined in the antepenultimate paragraph.

The contradiction of this nineteenth century system -- of sovereignties assumed absolute and at the same time particular, and pursuing particular ends of competing economic interests -- was brutally exposed in the First World War. Hegel in his time saw in such a collision "the [manifest] dialectic of the finitude of these spiritual communities (PhR. 340)"[30] and the coming into being of a world community whose moving end [would be] to realize universally that concrete freedom which the particular states attained inwardly in the completion of their historical development. The attempt, following its ruin, to grasp what that inner structure of the nineteenth century European system was, to grasp what this inner [basis of] sovereignty might be if purged of its particular embodiments, only resulted in a confused and impotent attempt to form a common world government.[31]

For the logic of the relation of particular sovereignties which had come to the *telos* of a long Christian formation to the recognition of a universal or providential reason working in history to [become fully manifest], the states still had to suffer a long and difficult history. The first stage was a separation of their divided externality from a deceptive political sovereignty and of the terms of the division from each.[32] The radical positions of the so-called [right and] left Hegelians (anti-Hegelians they would better be called) took on a new life in the opposition of an existential nationalism to a universal Marxist will.[33] Contrary fascist and Marxist parties -- the two positions are abstractions from the concrete unity of individuals and their institutions -- divided European states in more and less virulent forms, seizing power when they could, until the opposition took a general form and collided in the Second World War.

In this conflict of the opposed elements of post-modernism neither appeared in its purity. To attain the dominance it sought, each had to appropriate the spiritual resources of the state, [though] in a forced [amalgamation],[34] not in that which could come into

---

[30] The MS translates *Erscheinende* as 'appearing -- that is phenomenological -- '. The passage referenced is a celebrated one wherein Hegel describes the dialectical logic according to which, out of the historical conflict of the European nation-states, a post-national or world-historical spirit is to emerge motivated directly by the demand for a universal human freedom. JD views the cataclysmic wars of the twentieth century in this context, as the final, self-inflicted death-throes of European nationalism. The question then becomes what one is to make, politically and philosophically, of the aftermath; of the emergent post-nationalist, post-Christian and post-modern world. JD is concerned to show that while 'post-modernism' reflects an awareness of a vast spiritual sea-change, it expresses it only as a positive *fait accompli,* negatively counterposed to a spiritual world-history which it either abandons entirely or reduces sceptically or linguistically to rubble.

[31] I have attempted again to overcome certain parsing uncertainties. The MS has "A knowledge of the structure of that nineteenth century European system and thus of it as the way to a grasp of what this inner sovereignty was, purged of its particular embodiment, only followed its ruin in a confused and impotent attempt to form a common world government."

[32] The penultimate paragraph argues that before the Great War the idea of a humanist order in opposition to the state was embraced only by a radical few; traditional sovereignties, however 'deceptive', being otherwise generally maintained. JD now argues that in the era between the Wars humanist ideology would successfully usurp and corrupt the states themselves, its own inner contradictions being forced to the fore thereby.

[33] The MS refers to 'left Hegelians' only. But of course the later nationalism to which JD refers and its more radical form as fascism, has roots in right-Hegelianism (e.g. Gentile).

[34] MS: 'unity'.

view through their stronger separation. The voluntary union of by now nearly all the European states in the framework of a common state has required a further development in the relation of the elements. The existential aspect, notably in the writings of Martin Heidegger, disowned the violent Nietzschean subjectivity [which animated] Nazism and became more passive in nature, more receptive of an older spirituality temporalized, defining its opponent more generally as a universal economic-technical will. 'Technocracy' [on the other hand], is pluralistic, a segment of the 'global economy' without its own political centre, as in Leninized Marxism.

{MS-3} The competition of these forms had [thus] been blunted in Europe by their inclusion within the bureaucratic framework of a common state. Linguistic, cultural communities coexist with the equalizing force of the global economy. In [this] structure both [aspects] are democratized: the universal rights of individuals [are] given primacy over constitutional arrangements, as over legislative and judicial powers. In this relation, while one knows in general what the underlying rights of individuals are, how they are to apply to them in their endless particularity is ever provisional and uncertain. In the same way, as the philosophical confidence of Feuerbach, Marx, Nietzsche, Heidegger in his phenomenological stage, and [the other] recent schools generally has been broken, [so now] it is uncertain whether there can be philosophy at all, [as in the practical sphere] government, in the relation of public opinion to legislation and its judicial interpretation, has become a contingent reflection of these elements one on the other.[35]

[In this context] a recognition of the unity of the divided elements may take the form of an admiration of the primitive, for in all human communities there is something of objective, institutional form - of family, economic relations, governance - in relation to which individuals are in some manner unified. Within primitive institutions the least of subjective freedom. But into such forms an existential subjectivity can read its own freedom and make of primitives guardians of nature against technological destruction. Individuals in flight from a Christian religion, [considered] oppressive of anarchic

---

[35] MS-3 summarizes the same matters: "[The] nineteenth century world was already virtually post-modern and post-Christian. Modernity and Christianity [had become] centred in national cultures [as] competing parts of a humanity ever more sufficient to itself through scientific and technical progress. The contradiction between the particularity of these national states and their unqualified sovereignty was played out in competition for world empire and [finally] in the collision of the First World War, in which was expressed, with brutal clarity, the limit of the system. [Thereafter] the break with the former realm of faith and philosophy became more complete. Radical positions of earlier origin took hold, which [either] assimilated state to society - the equality of individuals in the whole range of their interests and passions - or else [would] rest it on race and culture or as residing the particularity of language. [The tendency either way] was to confer unmediated despotic political power on 'leaders' whose intuitive genius was to discern the way to [popular] desired ends. As fascism and Marxism these opposed forms contended for world domination until they destroyed each other in the Second World War. The contradiction [between the appeal to] a spurious universality [on the one hand] and to linguistic communities [one the other, saw] universal rights at once recognized and oppressed. The limit of the sovereign nation state, the necessity that its particularity be situated within the universality to which subjectivity it gave primacy in the form of rights, had been exposed by the first general conflict of the nations. [An] imposed and violent recognition became by the subsequent argument voluntary, in the sense that the fragmented freedom of existential and equalized individuals, in which [any sense of] the unity of existential [individuality and] universality in self-consciousness is lost, had evidently, without that unity, nothing more to stand on and could only peter out."

freedom, can more easily recognize the religious interest common to humanity in religions that have not much of reason in them. Thus, according to an opinion now current, Canada is an association of aboriginal peoples and English and French linguistic-cultural communities - of those at the first beginnings of a rational freedom and those who would be liberated from reason.[36]

{MS-2} But one knows that humans, as rational, are unable for long to live within finite ends. That is true even if, as in Enlightenment and post-modernism, there is present also a universal end -- happiness, the realized good of individuals, or however named. The scepticism of indefinite difference does not suffice. There is need to go beyond [ever-receding] limits. The less and more adequate forms in which an infinite end is discovered by post-moderns deserves the closest attention. The process leads in the end to a recovery as actual of the whole historical mediation which led to a knowledge of a concrete spirituality, [a mediation] lost in the externalization or temporalization of that standpoint in its initial realization.

{MS-3} [For as by] successive stages the post-modern, post-Christian world has lost intrinsic stability and begins to look beyond itself, a new relation opens to former philosophies. It was not [as if] the giants of that world had [actually] overthrown religion and philosophy. The relation is analogous to that of the subjective culture of the Hellenistic-Roman age where individuals, against the ethical order of the *polis* and the hard objectivity of the *res publica Romana,* thought to have freedom and the enjoyment of their right as persons in a human world - only to experience the disintegration of that world in a scepticism which could not find a universal inclusive of particularity. In that age one turned inward from the chaos of temporal life to an intelligible world and a unity before division, of which nature and the sensible world could then be known as a well-ordered image.

That contemplative reconciliation already appeared superficial to Augustine as not concretely unitive of the two worlds, [nor] subjectively of the human individual. [In] the post-modern, post-Christian world the awakening to a need [to] know what [its own standpoint] is [satisfied only] in the [recognition] of a concrete spirituality, a 'third philosophy', which it supposes itself already to [possess]. But [as] awakening in the contemporary division between a desired existential concreteness and the equalizing freedom of the technical-economic society, philosophical thinking more readily gives weight to one or the other pole of this division. Thus some find their way from the later

---

[36] MS-4 (much edited) has: " [The appeal to a naturalistic political culture] which has become a force in the historicized world of post-moderns [is] problematical in that [the coincident philosophical conviction that] institutional order depends on rights and freedoms of individuals -- claimed as inherent and immediate in individuals and centred in life and nature -- is simply not intelligible on this standpoint. When applied, for example, to the Canadian federation whose institutions are derivative from modernity, the effect is to undermine them, to put on one level European peoples formed in a rational, mostly Christian, tradition and aboriginal tribes having from their own culture only the rudiments of an order in which individuals as rational subjects can be thought to be endowed with universal political and human rights."

Heidegger to medieval Christianity, mediated to the world through some form of Christianized Neoplatonism. For them our loss of religion and philosophy has its source in the subjectivity of the modern age, the mistaken turn philosophy took with Descartes, reaching its extreme in Hegel.[37] For others a benevolent development of the global economy grounded in Protestantism and morality is the way to the spiritual as well as economic liberation of humanity. Both have in them a certain unification of the divided terms of post-modernity, but extraneously from the standpoint of the old[er] and [of] the modern philosophy.

The first of these two forms finds relations to the existential aspect of post-modernity, holds to nature and would limit the exploitation of it by the subjective thought of the modern age. The other has confidence that democracy and a technical-economic culture globalized, if guided by a morality roots in Protestant faith, can advance the well-being of humanity indefinitely. Neither form has place for the Hegelian argument that the ancient philosophy, reaching its limit, gave way to the modern, and this in turn to the third philosophy of whose historical existence post-modernity is a certain form.

More generally, to attempt in the 'post-modern' world to separate what is 'pre-modern' from what is 'modern' - Protestantism, Enlightenment - would be to use in vain a Procrustean sword. The philosopher, whose office is to understand the world in which he is, cannot stay with the common division of post-modernity into an existential side and a technological having its roots in modernity. People do not in reality live in one or the other but in both. To rediscover the historical mediation forgotten in post-modernity is not to [retreat or] divide but to attend to the whole mediation, [ancient,] medieval and modern. If one would know what [the] universal human rights presupposed in post-modernity mean, and in what institutional order they could be given definite and stable interpretation, one must look impartially at both aspects of post-modernity, [including also the recovery] of the spirit of modernity and on what basis its excesses, unbound in post-modernity, can be converted to the good of free individuality as their proper end.

---

[37] This recovery is attractive especially to that part of the Christian world which has maintained its medieval order and a knowledge of its doctrine through forms of ancient philosophy. The new Neoplatonisms ... seem able to join hands with post-modernism as against an earlier retreat from modernity and post-modernity which, with absolute Papal authority, would maintain the pre-modern church against the world ... The relation of 'post-modernism' in its completed existential development to Neoplatonism has difficulties, [however], which, being well considered, compel the conclusion that it is at best a partial recovery of the intelligible basis of the post-modern. The first and crucial difficulty is that, while the original Neoplatonism knew from its Stoic and Sceptic antecedents a unity beyond the finitude of both an objective or *noetic* world and a comprehensive *noesis* or subjective world, the new Neoplatonism finds its beginning in a Presocratic logic which had not thus appropriated finitude to self-conscious thought... If Heidegger in a way, by drawing an older poetic language into the circle of his thought, surmounts the difficulty, it recurs explicitly in Derrida's *différence* and is generally an obstacle for post-moderns... They must find themselves in the difficulty of Anaxagoras, who brought into philosophy an undivided *nous* but as confronting all else as divided or 'mixed'. This difference from the original Neoplatonism, while it may appear to give to the new a more positive quality, cannot but make [its] structure uncertain.

Conclusion

{MS-3} The dissolution of the post-modern society as a contradictory relation of existential particularity and equality of differences is for Hegel the disclosure of the ethical order of the state in its third form - as world history. The concrete freedom in which European nations reached the term of their historical development, as giving to their institutions and their freedom in them the form adequate to that of their Christian belief, is no longer borne primarily by peoples of a particular national temperament, language and culture, but, as universal, draws all peoples to it. The historical scene has radically changed from the age of the nation states and their empires. There is now a common technical-economic culture equalizing individuals and 'liberating' them to an anarchic freedom, eroding the authority of traditional cultures and religions.

In this awakening to a universal world order, a post-modern freedom [in a] global economy can appear as the primary reality and controlling force. [But] there is present also in this society the need to reflect on itself and discover anew what it is; to grasp its own historical development and antecedents in earlier cultures and religions. The reason moving in that history -- the conflict of substantial unity and subjective freedom, the unification of the two and the transition of this unity into ethical institutions -- has, [however], an objectivity unattainable from the standpoint of the post-modern society as such. For those of a Christian tradition in its post-Christian form, this transition [might] appear as to an immediate unity of divided economic and communal moments -- a [return to] the primitive as healing the division. But the authority of the primitive, as having in it the least either of intrinsic stability or of subjective freedom, [tends to] give way to the attraction of cultures [that are] strongly stabilized [but] repressive of individuality.

{MS-1} Where the condition of peace among nations has been for some time the fear of mutual destruction, a fear that does not depart but has become more unregulated with the end of the 'cold war', the need is more urgent than in Hegel's time to discover on what this finite actuality of competing states rests, what the historical spirit taken universally is and what its relation to absolute spirit. Hegel's response to these questions must remind the reader of the *Civitas dei* of Augustine [where] the principal opposition is found to be between the human subjectivity awakening in relation to the absolute creative God of Judaism, and the subjective freedom mediated by the Greek and come fully into its own in the Roman world. The Christian religion, which had its historical preparation in these peoples, Augustine could only treat as guided by Scripture and a Pauline expression of its essential content. This representation or *Vorstellung* imposed on him [the requirement of] an absolute separation of the 'two cities' and prevented the recognition of truth in the religions and institutions of other than the Jewish people, unless in the Roman Empire and the philosophical grasp of its culture in Neoplatonism.

The Hegelian philosophy, containing the content of the Christian religion in conceptual form, could remove that radical division, enter into relation to other peoples [and cultures] from the most primitive to the original Paradise, [finding] in the Greeks and Romans the logic of the *preparatio evangelii*. Hegel can then find in history the immediate relation of individuals to an absolute end, and the conversion of a falling away

from that end into a free subjective relation to it. Christian history mediates between Augustine's *civitas dei* -- as possessing the absolute truth in separation -- and historical existence. [There] takes shape a world more and more conformed in its institutions, and [in] the spirit moving in them, to the unchanging belief of [all] peoples. And philosophy, in responding to the reason of the world that has broken from the *Vorstellung*, gives to [its] religious content the form of thought. At first in this work one drew on the ancient philosophy. Then, finding that this could not contain the concreteness of the *Vorstellung*, the need of which the structure of medieval institutions made felt, a new philosophy emerged founded on the religious belief itself and able to relate [that] belief [to] a secularity apparently radically opposed to it. And from that modern world in turn [has emerged] a more deeply Christianized secularity and a new philosophy.[38]

---

[38] It being uncertainly punctuated in the MS, I have altered this concluding paragraph somewhat to bring out what I think is JD's meaning. The unadulterated script reads: "The Hegelian philosophy containing the content of the Christian religion in conceptual form could remove that radical division, enter into the relation of other peoples from the most primitive to the original Paradise and find in the Greeks and Romans the logic of the *preparatio evangelii*. Hegel can thus find in history the immediate relation of individuals to an absolute end and the conversion of a falling away from that end into a free subjective relation to it. Christian history mediates between Augustine's *civitas dei* possessing the absolute truth in its separation and historical existence. In that relation takes shape a world more and more conformed in its institutions and the spirit moving in them to the unchanging belief of peoples and philosophy in respond to the reason of the world which to exist has broken from the *Vorstellung*, gives to the religious content the form of thought. At first in this work one drew on the ancient philosophy, then finding that this could not contain the concreteness of the *Vorstellung* the need of which the structure of medieval institutions made felt a new philosophy emerged founded on the religious belief itself and able to relate to the belief in a secularity apparently radically opposed to it. And from that modern world in turn a more deeply Christianized secularity and a new philosophy."