NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Kirill Chepurin

THE SOUL'S INTENSITY AND INDIVIDUALITY IN HEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY OF SPIRIT

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES
WP BRP 18/HUM/2013

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

Kirill V. Chepurin[1]

THE SOUL'S INTENSITY AND INDIVIDUALITY IN HEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY OF SPIRIT[2]

In this paper, I explore a peculiar triad found in Hegel's later anthropological thought: individuality, intensity, and *daimon* (or fate), the latter identified with what Hegel calls one's "intensive form of individuality." In his notion of the soul's intensity, Hegel is reconceptualizing Kant's idea of intensity of the soul towards an anthropological theory of individuality and the individual unconscious. Within this individual intensive "nucleus," *Kern*, one's "fate," *Schicksal*, is enclosed, directing a human individual towards his "sphere" within *Gemeinwesen*, the free community of spirit.

JEL Classification: Z.
Keywords: G.W.F. Hegel, philosophical anthropology, God, intensity

[1] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Department of Philosophy. Lecturer; E-mail: kchepurin@hse.ru

[2] Research on this paper was supported by grant 11-01-0183 from the National Research University Higher School of Economics' 2012-2013 Academic Funding Program. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at Siemens Stiftung (Munich), Bonn University, and Amsterdam University. I am grateful to the audiences present on those occasions for their comments and suggestions.

It is often said that Hegel, the thinker of universality, leaves no place in his system for the concretely human, the individually real. Starting at least from Feuerbach, Kierkegaard, Marx,[3] and even Fichte Jr.,[4] this has been one of the most persistent and vocal lines of criticism of Hegel's philosophical enterprise. To take a prominent recent example, Adriaan Peperzak in his fundamental study of Hegel's political thought points out that 'Hegel's advocate must show that human individuality has a meaning' for Hegel, must show, that is, that human individuality *as such* holds philosophical interest for him.[5] In this paper, I will take upon myself the task of being such an 'advocate' by undertaking to exploit an unfortunately neglected vein of Hegel's thought. My goal is to show that, while by no means exalting individuality, Hegel did not philosophically ignore it. Rather, he assigned a crucial place to 'the existing individual', to what he termed 'concrete subjectivity', in his Philosophy of Spirit. I will endeavor, in other words, to demonstrate that the individually real *is* in fact philosophically interesting for Hegel, that he takes great pains to discern and conceptualize its workings and its fundamental role.

To that end, I have chosen Hegel's Berlin Anthropology, or the doctrine of the human soul, as the subject of this paper.[6] For reasons of focus, I will limit myself to an attempt to make sense of a peculiar triad found in Hegel's anthropological discussions: *individuality*, the soul's *intensity* (or '*daimon*'), and *fate*. I will analyze the bond between a human individual and what may be called the 'individual unconscious' constituted by his daimon and fate, as well as present that triad (i) as Hegel's anthropological theory of individual experience and (ii) as the individually concrete foundation of the spiritual *Gemeinwesen*.[7] The anthropological triad in question is the

[3] See, e.g., (Easton 1977: 189): for Marx, 'Kant and Hegel [would] "make an abstraction of the individual" and thus degrade him'. Cf. Levine (2006: 29-30). On Feuerbach's critique, see (Stern 1993: 112): what is lacking in Hegel is 'the concrete individual'. See also (Hannay 2003: 30) on Hegel's 'indifference to the concretely situated individual to whom Kierkegaard appeals'.

[4] Despite that, in his *Anthropologie* (1856; 2nd ed., 1860), Fichte jr. developed further some of Hegel's anthropological themes, such as the soul's intensity, his grasp of Hegel's doctrine of man remained rather one-sided. See, for example, Fichte (1860b: 9). Cf. Fichte (1860a: 135).

[5] Peperzak (2001: 649).

[6] For some important general discussions of Hegel's Berlin Anthropology, see Greene (1972; 1993), Brinkmann (1998), Stederoth (2001: 103-276), and Ferrarin (2004: 234-283).

[7] *Gemeinwesen* is one of the words – indeed, I believe, the most significant one – Hegel uses to describe the true community. For him, *Gemeinwesen* is synonymous with the state, *Staat*. See, e.g., VPG: 59; Enz §343Z., TWA 9:373, §394, TWA 10:66; TWA 7:108, 110, 298, 331, 413, 474; TWA 4:266 ('ein wahrhaft höheres moralisches Gemeinwesen'), etc. The German word *Gemeinwesen* is the translation of the Latin *res publica*. See, e.g., Honecker (1995, 306). Cf. Kant, AA 6:311, 7:90-91 on 'das gemeine Wesen' as 'a Platonic ideal', *respublica noumenon*, and thus 'an example' for the organisation of the experience,

conceptual basis Hegel provides for the multiplicity of (what he calls) 'individual worlds'[8] and 'attitudes' to the world[9], each of which ultimately *matters*, even if Hegel himself sometimes pretends they do not.

Whereas Hegel is widely considered a 'communitarian'[10], I will attempt to demonstrate that, once we take into account Hegel's Anthropology, the order of priority becomes reversed: the totality of one's individuality – one's 'daimon' – is logically anterior to and defines one's relationship to the world as well as one's place within the *Gemeinwesen*, so that the path leads from individuality to the common world, not the other way around.

In Hegel, one's individual daimon is termed *Genius* – which is indeed Latin for 'daimon', and should not be confused with the romantic *Genie*[11] – and identified with what Hegel calls one's '*intensive* form of individuality', the 'concentrated' totality of one's soul, one's 'concrete subjectivity', or the 'actual man'.[12] In characterizing the soul as possessing intensity, Hegel is reconceptualizing Kant's idea of intensity of the soul.[13] The daimon exerts a decisive influence over the course of the individual's life, including the life of consciousness, not merely that of the soul, an influence of which the individual remains unconscious. Within this intensive 'nucleus', *Kern*, one's anthropological 'fate', *Schicksal*, is enclosed. Daimon and fate are for Hegel the conditions of possibility of one's individually real, not 'all possible', experience, and thus may be viewed as an important corrective to Kant's transcendental project.

Besides, in his Philosophy of Spirit Hegel attributes intensive individuality, or intensity – which is for him intensity of spirit – exclusively to the human soul, not the soul in general or any other kind of soul, since it is the only kind of soul directly 'posited' by the Absolute Spirit. It is

---

respublica phaenomenon. Also, importantly, *Gemeinwesen* is *not* identified by Hegel with *Herrschaft (imperium)*. On the contrary, Hegel's master/slave dialectic may be read as precisely a critique of the state as *imperium*.

[8] Enz §402Z., TWA 10:120, 121; §405Z., TWA 10:127, 132; §406Z., TWA 10:150; §408A., TWA 10:162 ('the ordered totality of one's individual world').

[9] Hegel calls these 'relations' or 'connections'. See, e.g., Enz §405A., TWA 10:126.

[10] In Stephen Houlgate's apt formulation, Hegel 'is understood to be one of the fathers of the communitarian view that human individuality is itself socially constituted'. See Houlgate (2001, 249). Cf. Ormiston (2004, 48) on the importance of Hegel's idea of 'conscience' as part of his 'theory of moral action': 'For the more widespread view, promoted by commentators such as Habermas, is the notion that Hegel does not in fact have any theory of individual actions […] Such a viewpoint is also implicitly present in the widespread appropriation of Hegel's thought by communitarians'. In this paper, I do not deal with Hegel's account of 'conscience', which is for him 'die tiefste innerliche Einsamkeit mit sich' (TWA 7:254), closely related as it may be to Hegel's anthropological account of individuality discussed here.

[11] Cf. Petry (1978: 496): 'In the German of Hegel's day, 'Genie' was applied to Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, Mozart etc., 'Genius' to the atmosphere of a locality, tutelary spirits, Descartes' demon etc.'

[12] Enz §405A., TWA 10:125-126; VPG: 68, 99.

[13] See my paper 'Kant on the Soul's Intensity'.

precisely with an examination of the human soul's spiritual *Bestimmung* that I will begin my paper. Next, I will provide an overview of Hegel's reworking of Kant's notion of the soul's intensity, proceeding then to his notion of daimon, as equated by Hegel with individual intensive 'nucleus' of the soul. After that, I will examine Hegel's anthropological notion of fate as directing an individual towards his own 'sphere' within the spiritual *res publica*, through which Absolute Spirit, as Hegel characteristically puts it, 'comes to itself'.

Along the way, other related themes will be discussed, such as the 'emptiness' of the animal soul, the divine 'play' of Absolute Spirit in the human realm as contrasted with its mere 'frolicking' in nature, the notion of 'measure' of the soul's intensity, or 'measure of *Genius*', and Hegel's conceptualization of personal death in terms of its destruction, the correlation between the 'scale' (*Maßstab*) of one's soul and the 'scale' of one's individual world of experience, the relation between the principle of fate and the principle of consolation in Hegel, as well as one's free – not 'blind' – participation in the *Gemeinwesen* as 'the work of the world' ('das Werk der Welt').

The soul's intensity and fate are in Hegel, so to speak, the individual anthropological characteristics of what he calls the 'play of Absolute Spirit with itself', as realized, individually, through every human soul and, cooperatively, through the free *res publica* of spirit. It is not as if Absolute Spirit is playing 'above' the heads of individuals. Quite the contrary: individual souls inherently possess these characteristics as that which allows each human being to realize his own, 'inner' spiritual goals, through which, at the same time, the universal 'work of the world' is being accomplished. Every human individual, distinguished from the animal by the spiritual determination of his soul, is involved in this divine play, and it is only within this sacred play – as taking a meaningful part therein – that an individual is able to gain his true *freedom*. The whole triad – individuality, intensity (or daimon), and fate – receives in Hegel's philosophy a spiritual determination, as the irreducibly individual foundation of the universal reality of spirit.

1. The human soul as Geist.

It has been said that Hegel ascribes intensity, or intensive individuality, only to the *human* soul. To understand this, let us briefly consider the dividing line he draws between the human and the animal kind of soul. If the animal soul is studied in Philosophy of Nature, why attribute a special status to the human soul, one which merits the inclusion of Anthropology into Philosophy of Spirit, not Nature?

a. On the human soul's spiritual Bestimmung.

The answer may actually be derived from the inclusion itself. For Hegel, the human soul, in spite of its perceived naturalness, has an immediate spiritual determination which the animal soul lacks. Hegel's Anthropology begins, logically, with Absolute Spirit's 'positing' of itself as an individual human 'soul';[14] the human soul is a spiritual totality, with its nature itself transformed by spirit and thus belonging, ontologically, within the spiritual, not natural, domain. It is spirit, 'the immediate spirit',[15] and so 'must be grasped as spirit'.[16] 'The animal, however, is not yet spirit'.[17] The human soul is imbued with spirit as the peculiarly *human* potential. Spirit as *Bestimmung* is not only that by which a human being is defined, but also to which he is essentially called.[18] It is precisely from Anthropology, from the human, not animal, soul, that the path of spirit to itself begins, which is for Hegel the path to 'freedom'.[19]

In one of his lectures on Philosophy of History Hegel expressly insists on this point: the 'natural state' of a human soul is 'animal *humanity*', not at all 'animal dullness', *Dumpfheit*.[20] 'Animal humanity', says Hegel, is 'completely different from animality'; 'spirit does not develop itself out of the animal, does not take its beginning from the animal'; spirit begins 'from spirit', i.e., from the human, not animal, soul. The animal has no 'potency' for thought, whereas even the 'first cry of a [human] child' bears the 'seal' of spirit and cannot be ontologically reduced to anything merely 'natural'.[21] For Hegel, we have in fact never been animals.

It would seem that, from the logical standpoint, Hegel's Anthropology should be regarded as the direct outcome of, as *continuous* with, Philosophy of Nature. But, considered essentially, the

---

[14] VPG: 31.

[15] Enz §387, TWA 10:38; §387Z., TWA 10:40.

[16] VPG: 11. Cf. VPG: 3, 20, 30. Cf. (Brinkmann 1998). On the soul as *Naturgeist*, see VPG: 20, 30; Enz §387, §§391-395.

[17] VPG: 25.

[18] See, e.g., VPG: 6-7. One should not think that the spiritual *Bestimmung* is attributed by Hegel to the soul 'in general', as if it were an abstract soul-principle defined in isolation from an actual human being. On the contrary, it is a human individual, or this particular 'finite spirit', who is spirit. The soul, says Hegel, 'has its actual truth only as *individuality*, subjectivity' (Enz §391, TWA 10:51). Moreover, individuality is ascribed by Hegel to *every* stage of the soul's development: 1) to the human 'natural soul', even prior to the process of sensation (VPG:31-32), 2) to the 'feeling soul', with its individual daimon, and finally 3) to the 'actual soul' as 'the consolidated individual' ('das bei sich festgewordene Individuum'; VPG: 133). These are all stages of development of one and the same human individual.

[19] VPG: 7.

[20] Cf. how, in his lectures on the history of philosophy, Hegel speaks of Jacob Boehme's *awakening* from the *Dumpfheit* of nature to the life of spirit ('was ihn innerlich erweckte aus trüber Dumpfheit'; VGP: 79). Spirit is a *potency* within the human being that must be actualized.

[21] Cited from Stederoth (2001: 106-107). Cf. VPG: 52: '[G]leich nach der Geburt zeigt es [=das Kind] sich als Menschliches'. Thus Anthropology is not a 'prehistoric' moment, but that of man's fundamental directedness to and within spirit, which means to history and at the same time already *within* it.

individual human soul asserts its essential *otherness* from its supposed source in nature, its subordinateness to the spiritual, not natural, principle that permeates it. It is as if, in Hegel, the transition from Philosophy of Nature to Anthropology acted in *suspension* of the natural order so as to *inaugurate* the spiritual one. The same words that Hegel says of the birth of a human child may be said of the logical birth of every human soul: 'The birth is a *saltus*, no merely gradual change'.[22] It is a qualitative leap to spirit rather than a seamless continuity.

b. Two kinds of spirit's play.

This qualitative leap from nature to spirit is theorized by Hegel in terms of *play*. There are two kinds of Absolute Spirit's play – in nature and in the human realm – fundamentally distinct in their character and significance.

It is, as we have seen, because of its spiritual root that the human soul is studied in Philosophy of Spirit, not Nature. With Anthropology, the epoch of spirit begins, the process of spirit's self-cultivation, *Bildung*, as possible only in and through individual human beings and their *Gemeinwesen (res publica)*.[23] In order to fulfill itself, Absolute Spirit posits itself as a human soul. This 'positing of the immediate' is the activity of 'spirit itself'. The soul is something 'pre-posited', 'pre-supposed' by spirit. 'We know', says Hegel, 'that it is *spirit* which presupposes itself as the soul'; it is '*a play of Absolute Spirit with itself*', the goal of which is for spirit 'to come to itself'[24] – a divine, sacred play. This play, which inaugurates Anthropology, involves every 'finite spirit', or every human being.

The second kind of spirit's play, which is opposed to the first and may be called a 'generic' one, is relegated by Hegel to the realm of nature. In nature in general, and in animal nature in particular, Absolute Spirit 'only *frolics*' ('der darin nur *ausgelassen* ist'). Spirit in nature is 'a Bacchic god unrestrained and unable to grasp itself'.[25] For Hegel, animal individuality is hollow;

---

[22] VPG: 52.

[23] Cf. Peperzak (2001: 135). Cf. Magnus (2001: 214): 'Spirit is the self-constituting unity of the divine and the human. […] [O]ne makes a grave mistake if one tries to ascertain which elements of spirit pertain to the human and which to the divine'.

[24] VPG: 31.

[25] Enz §247Z., TWA 9:25. This comparison, and the derogation of the Bacchic revel it involves, seems to suggest a break with Hegel's own 'bacchic' conception of truth in the Preface to the Jena *Phenomenology*: 'Das Wahre ist so der bacchantische Taumel, an dem kein Glied nicht trunken ist; und weil jedes, indem es sich absondert, ebenso unmittelbar [sich] auflöst, ist er ebenso die durchsichtige und einfache Ruhe' (TWA 3:46). For an interpretation, see Harris (1984: 107). Cf. Harris (1997: 555): 'The "Bacchic revel" is Hegel's most primitive image of "truth". In the image, we have the triumph of measure over the "boundlessness" of the Absolute as Light'. If we accept that the notion of *measure* is indeed presupposed in the Jena definition of truth as the 'Bacchic revel', then we cannot fail to notice how far this is from Hegel's later opinion of nature as a frivolous playground for spirit, especially as characterized by *Ausgelassenheit* which for Hegel means precisely the *absence* of measure. (See, e.g., VPG: 6.) But cf. also Harris (1997: 122).

it is not inward but external only.[26] An animal is always one of its generic kind, and its individuality is of the lowest grade, spiritually sterile, founded upon the abstract 'universal animal process',[27] which is at the same time the biological process of genus.[28] There are only two sorts of 'fullness' or 'completeness' available to an animal individual: first, *satiety*, assimilation of that which is other to the animal – i.e., food – and the ensuing 'satisfaction'.[29] And secondly, an animal's *generic* fullness, achieved by fulfilling 'the drive' to 'integrate itself' with the genus. The drive in question begins with the 'tension' of genus in the individual, followed by a satisfaction of this tension 'in another of the same genus', out of which there emerges the 'feeling of universality', the animal's generic perfection.[30] This is 'the highest that is available to the animal': an animal cannot attain to the *spiritual* kind of completeness, the actualization of spirit, peculiar to the human being.[31]

Spirit's 'frolicking' in nature stands thus in contrast to the 'play of Absolute Spirit with itself' (a *synthesis* of play and seriousness), as this play is realized by individual human souls.[32] As the animal individual stands at the center of the first type of play, the human one finds himself at the crux of the second. The empty animal soul is distinguished from the human soul, with its spiritual *Bestimmung* and, as a result, its distinct kind of individuality – its '*intensive* form of individuality',[33] as Hegel calls it, or the soul's intensity, to the examination of which we now must turn.

2. The soul's intensity and daimon.

Hegel's notion of the soul's intensity owes its origin, if not its character, to Kant's criticism of rational psychology in the first *Critique*. In the *Science of Logic*, Hegel points precisely to Kant

[26] Hegel's identification of emptiness and animality goes back at least as far as his early Jena period. See JS: 201: 'die leere Stimme des Tiers'. Cf. SS: 24: the animal voice 'ist ein Leeres, Totalitätsloses, Formales'. Cf. Dickey (1987: 269) and Harrison (2003: 64-65).

[27] Enz §356 and 356Z., TWA 9:459.

[28] VPG: 25-26. Cf. (Brinkmann 1998: 8): contrary to the human soul, the soul in nature is merely 'the universal metabolism of life'.

[29] Enz §351Z., TWA 9:432. Cf. Enz §§357-366.

[30] Enz §369 and §369Z., TWA 9:516-517.

[31] Cf. Enz §396Z., TWA 10:76. Cf. a parallel in Barton (2001: 133): 'Pliny goes on to say that the ability to express the spirit (*explanatio animi*) was what distinguished a human being from a wild beast'.

[32] See also TWA 3:24. Here I disagree with Cyril O'Regan's (1994: 123) interpretation, which seems to insist on the incompatibility of 'play' and 'seriousness', *Ernst*, in Hegel. Cf. Hegel's characterization of Greek 'sport' ('play', *Spiel*) as a *spiritually* playful activity informed by 'der höhere Ernst' (TWA 12:297-298). Cf. also Hodgson (2005: 144, 168, 271).

[33] Enz §405A., TWA 10:126.

as having 'applied the determination of intensive quantity' to 'a metaphysical definition of the soul'.[34] In other words, Kant introduced the theme of the soul's intensity by attributing intensive quantity to the soul, in what seems to be a 'metaphysical' context, that of rational psychology. Hence if we are to properly grasp Hegel's reworking of Kant's notion of the soul's intensity, we must examine, very briefly and summarily, the Kantian roots themselves.

a. Kant on the soul's intensity.[35]

The notion of the soul's intensity is introduced in Kant's reply to Moses Mendelssohn – in the *Critique of Pure Reason* and the lectures on metaphysics – as a part of his wide-ranging polemic against rational psychologists. In his reply, Kant attempts to refute Moses Mendelssohn's proof of the immortality; and it is to achieve such a refutation – although it remains a question whether or not he actually achieves it – Kant introduces a distinction between *extensive* and *intensive* magnitude as attributed to the soul. Even if the soul, being simple and numerically self-identical, cannot possess any kind of extensive magnitude, still it arguably can possess an 'intensive magnitude', 'a degree of reality',[36] or, simply put, an intensity, so that death can be thought of as a diminishing, or 'remission',[37] of the soul's intensity until it reaches zero. The soul, says Kant, can pass away 'through an *evanescence*'.[38]

For the purpose of this paper, I will only point out the main defining features of Kant's notion of the soul's intensity. First, Kant does not seem to distinguish in kind between intensity of the body (mass, temperature, etc.) and intensity of the soul: both are simply *quanta*. This point will be important in light of Hegel's distinction between anthropological and phenomenological intensity.

Secondly, even though Kant presents his reply as an *immanent* criticism, one that builds upon rational psychology's own presuppositions – most importantly, the soul's simplicity and substantiality – the soul is grasped by him *not* as a simple substance, but as a bundle of powers (representation, consciousness, cognition, etc.) without any substantial 'centre' or 'nucleus'. In other words, whereas the 'metaphysical' proof of the soul's immortality has to do with the substantiality of the soul, Kant in his counter-argument *shifts the premise* of the debate from the assertion 'the soul is a simple substance' to the twofold assertion, 'the soul is a simple substance *and* it has a set of powers,' and then quietly *drops* the first part of that premise.

[34] TWA 5:258.

[35] This subsection summarizes some of the conclusions of my paper, 'Kant on the Soul's Intensity'.

[36] CPR, B414.

[37] CPR, B414. Cf. AA 29:1037.

[38] AA 29:1038.

Accordingly, the soul's intensity is theorized by Kant not as intensity of substance, but as a kind of aggregate intensity of the soul's activities, intensity of the *bundle* of powers that is the soul. The 'gradual remission of the soul's powers',[39] and the ensuing death of the soul, means here the remission of *every* power of the soul until the activity of each – and, consequently, the aggregate activity of the soul – reaches zero.

Finally, since the soul-substance is reduced by Kant to its 'phenomenal' aspect (its activities), without any reliance upon the 'noumenal', the notion of the soul's intensity can be justified within the *transcendental* framework. Kant's reply pretends to be immanent, but in fact it proceeds from within the Critical context, so that intensity of all phenomenal activity of the soul turns out to be grounded in intensity-as-*form* peculiar to the epistemic activity of the transcendental subject, as explicated in Kant's principle of the Anticipations of Perception.

b. Hegel: the soul's intensity as intensity of spirit.

Hegel substantially transforms Kant's notion of the soul's intensity. First, he understands it as intensity of *spirit* and limits it to the human soul, as a result of the latter's spiritual determination. Secondly, he distinguishes between anthropological intensity of the soul's 'nucleus' and phenomenological intensity of consciousness. Finally, he grasps the soul's intensity as *individual*, in terms of 'daimon' and 'measure'.

The soul's intensity is for Hegel intensity of spirit, not of natural being, or 'thing', *Ding*, or even a bundle of 'phenomenal' activities, as in Kant's argument. The soul, avers Hegel, is not a *Seelending*, but 'spirit'. Spirit, however, possesses 'completely different intensity', a different type of intensity, not the 'phenomenal' kind of intensity falling under the category of pure 'quantum'.[40] This type of intensity can be legitimately attributed only to the *human* soul. The intensive character of human individuality – the intensive 'nucleus' of a human soul[41] – turns out to be an important consequence of its spiritual determination.

Once again, we should not assume that Hegel preserves *only* the spiritual kind of intensity. In fact, he appropriates Kant's 'phenomenal' conception of intensity as part of his Phenomenology, and even references Kant's reply to Mendelssohn.[42] But whereas for Kant intensity of the soul's activities is grounded in the a priori form of intensity, for Hegel this groundedness is *anthropological*, and thus individual. The phenomenological intensity of consciousness is rooted,

[39] AA 29:1037.

[40] TWA 5:258-259.

[41] Enz §405A., TWA 10:126.

[42] VPG: 11.

as we are soon to see, in the anthropological intensity of the soul's 'nucleus', which has a certain 'measure'. It is only phenomenological, not 'nuclear', intensity which falls under the category of pure intensive quantity.[43] Anthropological intensity is the 'substantial force'[44] of the soul as concentrated into the unity of its 'nucleus', its 'intensive form of individuality', or 'daimon': 'that intensive form of individuality [is] called *Genius*'.[45]

c. Daimon and the individual unconscious.

It is one's daimon – the intensive individuality of *this particular* human being in a 'concentrated' form – which underlies all further determinations and relations of the individual, including *conscious* ones, serving as their anthropological foundation and essentially defining them. 'That nucleus of feeling' in its 'wrapped-up simplicity', says Hegel, 'contains within itself not only' one's 'natural' qualities, but also '*all* further connections and essential relations' and 'fates' of the individual. Even though the 'development of one's consciousness' should be distinguished from one's 'intensive form of individuality', nevertheless it is precisely one's daimon that 'has *the last word* in determining the semblance of mediations, intentions, and grounds, to which the developed consciousness surrenders itself'.[46] One's daimon is one's 'concrete subjectivity' understood as 'activity' and the 'totality of [one's] reality and life', as the 'totality' of one's individual experience of the world.[47] One's daimon is the 'actual man'.[48]

In other words, for Hegel, in our every action or relation to the world 'the last word' belongs *not* to our consciousness, but to the daimon, the unconscious 'totality' of the individual soul. An individual ascribes to himself, on the basis of consciousness, all kinds of 'intentions and grounds', but in reality, says Hegel, – and this becomes evident at the level of Anthropology – the 'conscious' character of such a rationalization is but a 'semblance', *Schein*, an unconscious self-deception. The reasons for one's actions are thus articulated retrospectively. All the local manifestations and relations of the individual are underwritten not, or not only, by one's conscious activity, but rather by the feeling 'totality' of the soul, the daimon.[49] The daimon is a 'nucleus' which is anterior to one's relations to the 'external' world and at the same time

[43] VPG: 11.

[44] VPG: 92.

[45] Enz §405A., TWA 10:126.

[46] Enz §405A., TWA 10:126; emphasis mine.

[47] Enz §405A., TWA 10:125.

[48] VPG: 99 ('der wirkliche Mensch'). It is worthwhile to note that Christ is also called 'der wirkliche Mensch' by Hegel. See TWA 14:23, 15:47, 17:310, 19:506; VGP: 15.

[49] Cf. Enz §405Z., TWA 10:132.

inclusive of them,[50] being, so to speak, 'excessive' over them. It is one's 'particularity' which, 'in all situations and relations', 'decides upon one's actions and fate' – an 'inner' 'oracle' influencing 'all decisions of the individual'.[51] What the daimon dictates is the 'particular' pattern of one's thought and feeling, one's *individual* experience of the world. It should be emphasized that the daimon, as having power over one's consciousness, is, of course, irreducible to one's 'natural', passive 'temperament',[52] but incorporates it, being the intensive 'totality', the way of all 'activity'.[53]

Daimon and fate are in Hegel not external – as, say, in Plato's myth of Er, where they are assigned to an individual soul from without, as an appendage[54] – but intrinsic, 'concretely subjective' forces acting from within and constituting an individual *as* this particular individual, with his characteristic patterns of feeling and thought. 'To given circumstances', Hegel avers, 'this determinate individual relates differently from a hundred other individuals',[55] so that these 'circumstances' somehow 'mingle with the inner' totality of the individual; in this way he is 'made into what he is'.[56] In one's individual experience, even what appears universal, 'das Allgemeingültige', is decisively influenced by one's daimon. The logical 'grounds', the 'universal determinations' or reasons that an individual produces for his actions proceed not from his consciousness, but from his 'feeling particularity'. Even the 'wakeful consciousness' is 'overwhelmed' by the 'might' of its daimon.[57]

d. Measuring one's daimon: Hegel on the soul's measure of intensity.

This relation between daimon and consciousness, the totality of one's soul and the individual world of one's consciousness, between anthropological and phenomenological intensity – the relation of 'grounding' or 'determining' – is grasped by Hegel logically, in terms of the relationship between *measure* and *quantity*, as explicated in the *Science of Logic*.

It has been said that, in Kant, the death of the soul may be understood as an 'evanescence', a 'remission' of its intensity. In his Anthropology, Hegel also connects one's death with one's 'intensive form of individuality', and does this by assigning to the soul's intensity a certain

[50] VPG: 99.

[51] Enz §405Z., TWA 10:132.

[52] See Enz §395, TWA 10:70; VPG: 48ff.

[53] Enz §405A., TWA 10:125.

[54] See Plato, *Republic*, 617d-620e.

[55] Enz §405Z., TWA 10:132. Cf. the epigraph to this paper from Hannah Arendt.

[56] Enz §405Z., TWA 10:132. Cf. (Greene 1972: 109).

[57] Enz §405Z., TWA 10:132.

measure. One's daimon as a 'feeling totality' 'falls under the category of being': 'the *Genius* has a measure' – and, 'once this measure is exceeded', the individual 'perishes'. The external and foreign 'content' – 'pain' – can enter and disrupt the 'unity' of one's daimon, so that the individual, says Hegel, 'can be overpowered by the inadequacy (*Unangemessenheit*) of that which happens to him to that which he normally is'. This inadequacy burrows deep 'into the feeling totality' of the daimon and 'explodes' its unity.[58] Besides this 'bursting' (*Zerspringen*), there is another way of exceeding the soul's measure. As Hegel states, the mediating consciousness may not be able to withstand the onslaught of the contradictions of which it is conscious and that threaten to destroy the measure of its intensity. In that case, death may occur in a mediated way, through one's *will* – the 'decision not to live any longer'[59] – so that the individual commits suicide. This was the way Cato the Younger died: he 'could not endure' the 'absolute contradiction' that entered his soul once 'the Roman republic', perfectly suited to his soul's measure, to 'his inner actuality', ceased to exist.[60]

Being within itself a balance of contradictions, which must not become unbalanced,[61] the soul's measure is acutely sensitive to contradictions coming from without. The destruction of one's measure is a personal kind of death: the individual is not indifferent to it. It is not death from 'the habit of living',[62] in which an individual is absorbed without a murmur into the genus. On the contrary, the destruction of one's measure is caused by an excess of contradictions, by pain, *Schmerz*. It is always a violent death, *experienced* by the individual.

The logical distinction Hegel draws is the following one: one's intensive soul-'nucleus' has a measure, whereas intensity of consciousness possesses a 'degree', *Grad*, or 'intensive quantity'.[63] Logically, measure is for Hegel the unity into which quantity and quality are sublated and which serves as their truth and their ground. The category of measure not only grounds that of quantity – measure in Hegel constitutes the foundation of 'the abstract further determination of quantity'[64] peculiar to phenomenological consciousness as the realm of abstract opposition (*Gegenstand*) – but also incorporates it; that is why Hegel says that the soul's

[58] VPG: 91-92.

[59] VPG: 92.

[60] VPG: 91; Enz §406A., TWA 10:135.

[61] On this balance, *Gleichgewicht*, within measure see TWA 5:450.

[62] VPG: 130.

[63] VPG: 11.

[64] TWA 5:392. It is measure which must constitute the basis of true *quantitative* study of nature ('einer Mathematik der Natur') if this study aims to grasp the *quality* in nature as well ('die Qualitäten der natürlichen Dinge'). True, or 'philosophical', mathematics must be a mathematics of measure, not of pure quantity. See Bondeli and Seelmann (2002: xx).

'measure' is also 'quantity'.[65] In other words, Hegel does not fully reject the quantitative determination of the soul. Rather, he insists that a different and at the same time related logical category is needed to comprehend the life of the soul, that of measure as the unity of quantity and *quality*: the soul is a qualitative totality, not merely quantitative. Pure quantity is external and 'indifferent to determinacy',[66] whereas one's daimon, the intensive 'nucleus' of the soul, is precisely one's internal 'determinacy', *Bestimmtheit*,[67] the qualitative foundation of the individual and his activity, both conscious and unconscious. The soul's measure is thus irreducible to quantity, just like measure in general. In distinction to pure quantity, measure in Hegel is not constituted from without or freely manipulable, but possesses, as D. G. Carlson puts it, a certain 'range of immunity from change'.[68] The soul's intensity or daimon may be weakened or destroyed, either immediately or mediatedly, through consciousness, and yet remains the intensive 'nucleus' of *one and the same* individual, within his own 'range of immunity'.

One's concrete activity, the manifestations of one's soul, should thus be grasped as a unity of 'soul' and 'consciousness', of quality and quantity, in other words, as measure. For Hegel – as stated already in the Jena *Phenomenology,* albeit in different terms[69] – the 'scale' of one's 'individual world' correlates with the 'scale' or measure of one's soul. The world of one's consciousness – one's 'objective' world – is developed precisely out of the daimon which 'builds the objectivity' of the individual.[70] The concentrated 'actuality' of the daimon is what produces this individual world out of itself.[71] My world of consciousness, the 'ordered objective complex of the understanding I have before myself' is already present 'in a wrapped-up (*eingehüllte*) way within me: *I* am it'.[72] The daimon, the individual 'nucleus' of one's intensity, is the substantial totality of 'force', *Kraft*, 'having a measure'.[73] This internal 'cohesion is the measure of everything that appears' to the individual.[74] The soul's core, says Hegel, is one's individual 'scale (*Maßstab*) of subsumption'. 'This totality is the scale with which I measure everything

[65] VPG: 79, 92.

[66] TWA 5:387.

[67] See, e.g., VPG: 107-108.

[68] Carlson (2008: 121).

[69] See TWA 3:365.

[70] Enz §405Z., TWA 10:132.

[71] VPG: 99.

[72] VPG: 68. See also VPG: 93: 'Es ist äußerlich, andererseits bin ich es selbst'. And VPG: 95: 'Der Mensch steht der äußerlichen Welt nicht nur als leer entgegen, sondern der Inhalt derselben ist sein eigener innerlicher Inhalt'.

[73] VPG: 68.

[74] VPG: 64.

that happens to me'.[75] It is the 'absolute power' over all the 'singularities' of my 'individual world'.[76] The relation between anthropological and phenomenological intensity is thus one between the substantial 'force' and the local manifestations of this same force, as falling within the unity of one's 'individual world'.

Also, one's soul-'nucleus' is, for Hegel, the source of what is pleasant and unpleasant to the individual. As internally 'defined', an individual possesses 'a contentful innerness, *Innerlichkeit*,' falling under the category of 'measure', which 'can be either adequate (*angemessen*) or inadequate to the content' that comes from without. 'In this way pleasure and aversion arise,' or the feeling of attraction and repulsion, as well as of 'harmony' and 'disharmony'.[77] All this proceeds from the soul's intensity or daimon, the intensive core of individuality. But how is the soul's intensive individuality – as possessing a spiritual determination – related to the goals of spirit? How, if it all, can it help generate a *vernünftig* social order, the *Gemeinwesen (res publica)*, and thus the coming to itself of Absolute Spirit?

3. Hegel's anthropological notion of fate.

a. Genius and Schicksal.

I believe that the most likely candidate for the 'missing link' between the soul's intensity and the goals of Absolute Spirit and the spiritual *Gemeinwesen* is Hegel's anthropological notion of 'fate', *Schicksal*, as precisely a determination within one's daimon, within the individual 'nucleus' containing all 'essential relations and fates'.[78] Just like in Plato's myth of Er, the daimon is the 'guardian' and 'fulfiller' of one's fate.[79] The soul's intensive individuality is what determines, intrinsically, the individual's fate: 'his *Genius* is his inner fate, for which he cannot account', the decisive determination in the 'manifold relations' of the individual.[80] The daimon, being one's 'doom', *Verhängnis*, is the inner 'oracle' in charge of the individual's fate. It is thanks to the *Genius*, says Hegel, that 'in given circumstances the fate of the individual acquires *this* and not another direction'.[81] That is why, for Hegel, every 'judgment on others' should be passed 'with sympathy' – every individual has his own *Schicksal*, enclosed within his daimon

[75] VPG: 65.

[76] VPG: 66. Cf. VPG: 19; Enz §408A., TWA 10:162.

[77] VPG: 82-83.

[78] Enz §405A., TWA 10:126.

[79] Plato, *Republic* 620d.

[80] VPG: 105. See also Stederoth (2001: 226).

[81] Enz §405Z., TWA 10:132; emphasis mine.

and dictating to him what 'relation' to establish.[82] This anthropological kind of fate is understood by Hegel not as a rigid 'predestination', but rather as one's internal sense of 'direction', the principal direction with which 'circumstances' 'intermingle'.[83] It is nonsensical to speak of 'fortune-telling' with regard to this kind of fate. The anthropological fate is but *one* side of the person's actions, a particular inner *Bestimmung*. It has no power over the 'circumstances' outside the individual. One's fate makes itself felt when, under specific circumstances, an individual cannot do (think, feel, etc.) otherwise. The circumstances are external, but *within* them one behaves in accordance with his daimon and fate, so that in given circumstances he naturally does this rather than that.

b. Anthropological fate vs. other notions of fate.

The anthropological kind of fate is located at the 'nucleus' of a human individual, not outside of it. It is an inner 'oracle', not extraneous, which, however, has its last word in the way an individual sees, arranges and transforms his objective world. That is why in the lectures on Philosophy of Religion Hegel argues firmly against the necessity of any *external* oracles, any 'objective' confirmation of one's 'singular fate',[84] such, for example, as augury by means of 'birds' or 'a lightning in the sky' – of all 'external, objective' vehicles for 'grasping one's resolve'.[85] Such external appearances have no bearing upon the anthropological fate, which is to be wholly distinguished from those notions of fate that depict it as a force 'beyond' the individual. Fate, Hegel insists, must not be understood as 'an alien relation of cause and effect', an 'other-worldly ground' of the individual's actions.[86] That would be too external and abstract a representation.

Even 'the ancients', despite the nobility of their character which allowed them to reject the formal understanding of fate in terms of mechanical cause and effect, could not grasp fate as truly intrinsic, as *one's own*. For them, the recognition and acceptance of one's fate was but the acceptance of an abstract necessity lacking any connection to one's 'nucleus', one's 'particular' being. True, 'the ancients' dismissed 'the empty talk of cause and effect' and nobly embraced the 'simplicity of necessity'. Still, the 'freedom' they thereby achieved was 'only abstract, standing above the concrete, the particular, but not in harmony with it'. It was 'the giving up' of one's

[82] VPG: 105.

[83] Enz §405Z., TWA 10:132.

[84] TWA 17:142.

[85] TWA 17:144.

[86] TWA 17:112.

soul.[87] In such a 'giving up', there can be no personal relation to one's fate, no 'misfortune', *Unglück*, in its inner sense, no spiritual misfortune which one would direct to the goals of spirit.[88] Anthropological fate is, by contrast, the fate inside an individual, not 'the selfless, all-destroying fate'[89] criticized by Hegel. In Anthropology, an individual *is* his fate. The anthropological fate is a determination enclosed within one's self. It is an internally defining principle – and, as such, it is *au fond* opposed to, say, the Roman notion of fate, which is already 'inner', and yet in an *abstract* manner, as an 'abstract innerness, the universality of destination … in which the particular individual, as well as the ethos, the humanity of the individual, is suppressed, is not concretely present, and does not dare to develop itself.'[90] By contrast, for Hegel, one's anthropological fate can and must 'develop itself'. On the one hand, logically, Absolute Spirit 'posits' itself as a human soul; hence the spiritual determination of the soul's intensity and fate. On the other, spirit is the goal of the soul's individual development characterized by one's daimon and fate. To progress to spirit, an individual must discern and accept his fate as *his own*.

c. Mastering one's fate: the principle of fate and the principle of reconciliation.

However, this acceptance must not be a 'blind' one. 'The blind fate is something unsatisfactory'.[91] An individual who has thoughtlessly accepted his fate is characterized by Hegel as being unable to rise above the given: 'he *is* what the circumstances and nature have made of him', accepting everything 'as a meaningless destiny, as *the way it is*'.[92] One's fate ceases to be blind when directed to spirit and 'ein sittliches Gemeinwesen'[93]. Having discerned his fate, an individual must 'develop' it. What Hegel rejects here is any kind of blind, non-judicious *Fortentwicklung*. In this sense, we may regard *Genius* and *Schicksal* as two unique anthropological characteristics with which Absolute Spirit 'invests' the human soul, but which the latter must first spiritually subordinate to itself, and then direct to the common goal of the spiritual *res publica*.

That is one of the reasons why Sophoclean tragedies, demonstrating the ways in which one's fate is inscribed in the 'circle' of 'ethical justice', are for Hegel 'the eternal examples of the ethical

[87] TWA 17:112.

[88] TWA 17:112.

[89] TWA 17:49.

[90] TWA 17:174.

[91] TWA 16:133.

[92] TWA 16:17.

[93] TWA 7: 298.

concept'.[94] The importance of the idea of fate is not limited to the ancient world and the ancient community. The modern individual must also grasp the directedness of his soul, including his daimon and fate, to the spiritual principle of ethical life – but with an important qualification: one's anthropological fate must not be accepted as external, but in a *personal* way, as 'concrete' and 'in harmony with the particular', including every 'misfortune' that might befall the individual.[95] We should not therefore think that the modern Christian 'principle of consolation' or 'reconciliation' is incompatible for Hegel with the ancient 'principle of fate'.[96] The principle of fate *remains* – at the anthropological level – whereas consolation is placed higher, at the level of spirit. What is needed is their synthesis: the modern individual must direct everything happening to him in accordance with his fate to a spiritual goal, so that even 'the negative' can be transformed into 'the affirmative'.[97]

But in order to do that, one must cease to regard his fate as something abstract, as a 'blind' fate, must appropriate it, 'take possession' of it, just as of the daimon, the 'feeling totality' containing one's fate.[98] This anthropological understanding of fate as enclosed within the soul's intensive core, and as that which must be put under control and directed to the goals of spirit, may be formulated in terms of intensity: the soul's individual measure of intensity must not be exhausted and destroyed in vain, must not be 'extensively' dissipated.

However, for Hegel, the modern individual tends towards precisely such an extensive waste of intensity, a *neglect* of the spiritual determination of his soul. To destroy 'his own valor, energy, the goals of fate' is the characteristically unworthy behavior of 'the modern man' with his 'modern capriciousness'. True, the modern individual possesses, within his soul, the internal principle of intensive *subjectivity* absent in the ancient world. However, such a 'depressiveness', 'fretfulness,' which also proceeds out of one's subjectivity, 'did not constitute the character of the ancients': the moderns lose their spirit too 'easily'. 'Vexation is the sentiment of the modern world'.[99] An appeal for the preservation of *both* fate and reconciliation is in Hegel an appeal for a synthesis of the ancient and the modern – which is already present, potentially, in the human soul possessing its intensity and fate as a result of its spiritual *Bestimmung* that must be directed back towards the goals of spirit.

---

[94] TWA 16:132.

[95] TWA 17:112.

[96] As does Lloyd (2008: 299-300). However, Lloyd does not at all take into account the anthropological notion of fate in Hegel.

[97] TWA 17:112.

[98] VPG: 88: the 'goal' of the individual, says Hegel, is to gain 'power over' the 'feeling totality', the 'daimon' of his soul; only in this way may one be able to attain to 'freedom'. See also VPG: 141, on the necessity of 'taking possession' of one's soul.

[99] TWA 17:131-132.

d. One's fate and 'das Werk der Welt'.

Of course, the givenness of fate is not the same as its fulfillment. Hegel is never satisfied with the given: spirit must never rest.[100] An individual must recognize his soul, including his daimon and fate, as his own, as that which makes him individual, and direct it towards the actualization of Absolute Spirit within the *res publica*.[101] One's fate is one's individual 'direction'; but how is this personal direction related to the common life of the *Gemeinwesen*? Here we encounter in Hegel an affinity between the subjective and the objective, an individual path from the former to the latter:

The attitude proper to man consists in [the recognition] that he has to do with a world that is already complete (*fertig*) in and for itself, a might so great that he cannot damage it, but wherein he can only seek a limited sphere to participate with his own activity. The goal he attains is, on the one hand, the goal of the world which carries on by itself; on the other hand, it is a subjective goal […] It is through [this individual] undertaking (*Geschäft*) that the great whole, the self-executing work of the world, specifies itself.[102]

It is precisely the multiplicity of fates and strivings, of individual 'spheres', each different from another, which makes the joint 'work of the work', the complex of the *Gemeinwesen* possible.[103] Each 'sphere' is precisely an 'actualization' of one's 'individual world', the individual totality of one's soul. To achieve this actualization, this fulfillment of one's inner fate, one must, through 'the labor of spirit', take possession of one's individuality, participating with it in the *vivere civile*.[104] The necessity of consciously, not 'blindly', mastering one's soul – one's fate, daimon, intensity – is rendered in Hegel as a kind of spiritual task, a stage required for an individual to be able to attain to spirit. It is a self-cultivation, a certain spiritual and ethical attitude to one's self. For Hegel, each individual is called to take part – an individually *meaningful* part – in 'the work

[100] That Hegel argues against 'the myth of the given', is well known. Cf. Kojève's (1969: 29) description of Hegel's master/slave dialectic, in which the slave is engaged in the constant activity of transformation of the given: 'The Master […] never attains the freedom that would raise him above the given World. […] Only the Slave can transcend the given World (which is subjugated by the Master) and not perish. Only the Slave can transform the World that forms him and fixes him in slavery and create a World that he has formed in which he will be free'.

[101] Cf. VPG: 21.

[102] VPG: 55.

[103] Cf. Augustine, *De civ. dei* XIX: 24.

[104] VPG: 57-58.

of the world', the *Gemeinwesen* (*res publica*) of spirit, through which Absolute Spirit 'comes to itself'. Only in this way does an individual gain his freedom.

This stands in strong contrast to Plato's account of the divine play in the *Laws*: for Plato, 'man was made as an object of amusement for the divinity'.[105] In Hegel, God's 'amusement' is relegated wholly to nature; in the human realm, spirit's 'frolicking' gives way to spirit's *Bildung*, self-overcoming and true freedom.[106] 'Where there is no state, no *Gemeinwesen*, nothing remains for man but low occupations'.[107] Any concrete freedom is a spiritual unity of an individual soul and the *telos* of Absolute Spirit as actualized in the spiritual *Gemeinwesen*.[108] Human individuality is in Hegel neither effaced nor erased, but constitutes an individually real foundation – as an 'individual world' and an individual 'sphere' – of the universal *res publica*.

Therefore, the principle of consolation, reconciliation, freedom, does not annul the principle of fate, but bestows it with the spiritual *Bestimmung*, which is precisely what Absolute Spirit gives to the human soul. The soul's intensity may be regarded as a 'gift' of Absolute Spirit. And it is to Absolute Spirit – as a return gift – that it can and must be given back, as that which would *individually* contribute to its coming-to-itself.

4. Conclusion: the concretely human.

The anthropological triad – individuality, intensity (or daimon), and fate – constitutes the ontological foundation for what makes my experience, my feeling and thought individual, singular, different from those of others. That is Hegel's way of conceptualizing the entire trajectory of an individual as precisely an individual path. It is that which he uses to explain the *multiplicity* of individual patterns of experience, of individual attitudes to the world. Even though, by themselves, the notions of 'daimon' or 'fate' may sound remote to the modern ear, the ontological and epistemological principles they are employed to convey – the individual character of experience, the plurality of 'individual worlds' – are perfectly familiar: in Hegel's Anthropology we are confronted, to use the words of A. J. Ayer, with 'the problem of explaining how the contents of the experience of different people can serve to construct a common world'.[109] The problem, in other words, is that of the relation between the individual world and the common world necessary for there to be true community.

[105] Hadot (2006: 183). See Plato, *Laws*, 803c: 'man is made to be the plaything of God, and this, truly considered, is the best of him'.

[106] Cf. Williams (1997: 292), Hodgson (2005: 240).

[107] VPG: 59.

[108] VPG: 55.

[109] Ayer (1968: 220).

The problem of the common lived world is thus in Hegel irreducible to the much-debated phenomenological problem of 'mutual recognition'.[110] In fact, it goes deeper, to Anthropology, to Hegel's theory of 'intensive' or 'concrete' individuality discussed in this paper. 'This totality, the soul, is the inner content of the I-consciousness'.[111] It would thus be a mistake to confuse the phenomenological 'I' in Hegel – the 'universal abstraction'[112] opposed to the 'concrete subjectivity' of the soul – with the human being as a whole. This kind of confusion is what may have driven those who, like Marx, criticized Hegel for substituting an empty abstraction *in lieu* of the actual individual. Consciousness, the 'I' is for Hegel the phenomenological, 'abstract' moment of subjectivity having an anthropological foundation precisely in the individual totality of one's soul. 'The soul', Hegel affirms, 'is consciousness';[113] and inversely, consciousness is 'the soul in the form of the [abstract] substantial universality'.[114] As we have seen, one's *Genius*, the 'actual man', is that out of which one's individual world of consciousness is produced. Next, one's fate is what allows to 'embed' the individual world into the universal 'work of the world', the spiritual *Gemeinwesen*, the common life which is, however, individually constituted.

'The individual', says Hegel, 'is something actual';[115] but, as we know, 'what is actual is rational' – hence, in Hegel, the rationality, *Vernünftigkeit*, of the individually formed *res publica*. One's daimon, the intensive individual 'nucleus' of one's soul, is precisely one's 'actuality',[116] the totality of one's 'individual world'. Without 'the contents of the experience of different people', without 'concrete subjectivities',[117] there could not be any actual co-operation (*Gemeinwesen*), and therefore any coming-to-itself of Absolute Spirit. In his Anthropology Hegel is concerned with the possibility of one's individually real, individually situated, not 'all possible', experience, as well as with the 'embeddedness' of this individual experience into the common world, which formally begins with the next stage of Philosophy of Spirit, the stage of Phenomenology. Hegel's Anthropology is, so to speak, a 'pneumatology from below', dealing with the individually concrete – the concretely human – foundation of the universal reality of spirit.

---

[110] See, e.g, Williams (1997).

[111] VPG: 142. See also VPG: 137, 141-143, 178, as well as Enz §413, TWA 10:199.

[112] VPG: 139.

[113] VPG: 11.

[114] Enz §414, TWA 10:201.

[115] VPG: 103: "Das Individuum is ein Wirkliches". See also VPG: 101 ('actual individuals'), 105 ('my whole actuality'), 106 ('the actual individuality').

[116] On one's daimon as one's *Wirklichkeit*, see VPG: 96, 103.

[117] Enz §405A., TWA 10:125.

References

Ayer, A. J. The Origins of Pragmatism: Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce and William James. – San Francisco: Freeman, Cooper & Co., 1968.

Barton, C. Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones. – Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Bondeli, M., and Seelmann, H. N. 'Einleitung.' In Hegel, G. W. F. Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Natur. Berlin 1819/20. – Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2002. – SS. vii-xxxv.

Brinkmann, K. 'The Natural and the Supernatural in Human Nature: Hegel on the Soul.' In Philosophies of Nature: The Human Dimension. Eds. R. S. Cohen and A. I. Tauber. – Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998. – SS. 3-18.

Carlson, D. G. 'Hegel and the Becoming of Essence'. In The Spirit of the Age: Hegel and the Fate of Thinking. Eds. P. Ashton, T. Nicolacopoulos and G. Vassilacopoulos. – Melbourne: re.press. – Pp. 118-132.

Dickey, L. Hegel: Religion, Economics, and the Politics of Spirit, 1770-1807. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Easton, L. D. 'Marx and Human Individuality'. In Marxism, Revolution, and Peace. Ed. H. L. Parsons and J. Somerville. – Amsterdam: Grüner, 1977.

Ferrarin, A. Hegel and Aristotle. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Fichte, I. H. Anthropologie: Die Lehre von der menschlichen Seele. 2. vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. – Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1860 (a).

Fichte, I. H. Contributions to Mental Philosophy. Transl. and ed. J. D. Morell. – London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1860 (b).

Greene, M. Hegel on the Soul: A Speculative Anthropology. – The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1972.

Greene, M. 'Hegel's Triadic Doctrine of Cognitive Mind'. In Hegel: Critical Assessments. Vol. 4. Ed. R. Stern. – London: Routledge, 1993. – Pp. 89-107.

Hadot, P. The Veil of Isis: An Essay on the History of the Idea of Nature. Transl. M. Chase. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Hannay, A. Kierkegaard and Philosophy: Selected Essays. – London: Routledge, 2003.

Harris, H. S. 'Hegel's Image of Phenomenology.' In Philosophy and Science in Phenomenological Perspective. Ed. K. Cho. – The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1984. – Pp. 95-109.

Harris, H. S. Hegel's Ladder. Volume 1: The Pilgrimage of Reason. – Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997.

Harrison, R. P. The Dominion of the Dead. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Hegel, G. W. F. System der Sittlichkeit. Ed. G. Lasson. – Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1967.

Hegel, G. W. F. Werke in 20 Bänden (Theorie Werkausgabe). Ed. E. Moldenhauer and K. M. Michel. – Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970.

Hegel, G. W. F. Jenaer Systementwürfe. Band 1. Ed. K. Düsing and H. Kimmerle. – Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1986 (a).

Hegel, G. W. F. Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie. Teil 4. Die Philosophie des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit. Ed. P. Garniron and W. Jaeschke. – Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1986 (b).

Hegel, G. W. F. Vorlesungen über die Philosophie des Geistes. Berlin 1827/28. Ed. F. Hespe and B. Tuschling. – Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1994.

Hodgson, P. C. Hegel and Christian Theology: A Reading of the Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Honecker, M. Grundriss der Sozialethik. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.

Kant, I. Gesammelte Schriften (Akademie-Ausgabe). Ed. deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften. – Berlin, 1900 ff.

Kojève, A. Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit. Assembl. R. Queneau. Ed. A. Bloom. Transl. J. H. Nichols, Jr. – Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Levine, N. Divergent Paths. Vol. 1: The Hegelian Foundations of Marx's Method. – Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006.

Lloyd, G. Providence Lost. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Magnus, K. D. Hegel and the Symbolic Mediation of Spirit. – Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2001.

O'Regan, C. The Heterodox Hegel. – Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Ormiston, A. Love and Politics. Re-interpreting Hegel. – Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004.

Peperzak, A. T. Modern Freedom: Hegel's Legal, Moral, and Political Philosophy. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2001.

Petry, M. J. 'Notes'. In Hegel's Philosophy of Subjective Spirit. 2. Anthropology. – Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1978. – Pp. 431-634.

Speight, A. Hegel, Literature and the Problem of Agency. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Stederoth, D. Hegels Philosophie des subjektiven Geistes: Ein komparatorischer Kommentar. – Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001.

Stern, D. S. 'Foundationalism, Holism or Hegel?' In Hegel: Critical Assessments. Vol. 3. Ed. R. Stern. – London: Routledge, 1993. – Pp. 93-107.

Williams, R. R. Hegel's Ethics of Recognition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Kirill V. Chepurin

National Research University Higher School of Economics. Department of Philosophy. Lecturer;

E-mail: kchepurin@hse.ru, Tel. +7 (495) 772-95-90*2698

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.