

How the Dreaming Soul Became the Feeling Soul, Between the 1827 and 1830 Editions of Hegel's Philosophy of Subjective Spirit: Empirical Psychology and the late Enlightenment

Jeffrey Reid

Abstract

Why does Hegel change “Dreaming Soul” to “Feeling Soul” in the 1830 edition of the Philosophy of Subjective Spirit? By tracing the content of the Dreaming Soul section, through Hegel’s 1794 manuscript on psychology, to sources such as C.P. Moritz’s *Magazin zur Erfahrungsseelenkunde*, the paper shows how the section embraces a late Enlightenment mission: combating supposedly supernatural expressions of spiritual enthrallment by explaining them as pathological conditions of the soul. Responding to perceived attacks on the 1827 edition of the *Encyclopedia* by Schleiermacher, Hegel alters the section and its heading, thereby including the pastor’s religion of feeling in the pathology of *Schwärmerei*.

Between the second, 1827 edition of his *Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences* and the ultimate 1830 edition, Hegel made a number of what might be considered minor changes, particularly in comparison with the extensive revisions undertaken between the first, 1817 edition and the second, “mature, if penultimate formulation”, as Robert Williams writes.¹ One change that does occur between 1827 and 1830 takes place in the Philosophy of Subjective Spirit (PSS)², where Hegel changes the section heading at §403 from “The Dreaming Soul (*Die träumende Seele*)” to “The Feeling Soul (*Die fühlende Seele*).” This paper explores the significance of this revision, which, although apparently minor, is hardly superficial. In fact, by calling attention to the original title, the change from “dreaming” to “feeling” invites us to investigate the origins of Hegel’s thought on this crucial section, whose insights into the particularities of the human soul remain largely unchanged, in spite of the heading change. The first object of investigation will

¹ Robert Williams, *Hegel: Lectures on the Philosophy of Spirit 1827-8* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) p.6.

² In this paper PSS refers to the Philosophy of Subjective Spirit as presented in both 1827 and 1830 editions. When I need do distinguish between these editions, I shall do so explicitly.

therefore be the sources of the dreaming soul. Discovering these origins will then enable me to propose an answer to why Hegel later changes “dreaming” to “feeling”.

The section under discussion falls within Hegel’s presentation of the soul (*Seele*), in the chapter entitled Anthropology. The soul, in the 1830 edition, is presented in three main articulations: a) the natural soul (§§391 - 402); b) the feeling soul (§§403 – 410); the actual soul (§§411 – 412). Out of the actual soul arises rational consciousness, through a skeletal re-enactment of Hegel’s famous *Phenomenology of Mind*, perhaps a better translation than “spirit” for *Geist*, in this subjective context (§§413 – 439). The outcome of the PSS, in Psychology, is rational consciousness articulating itself in theoretical intelligence (*Verstand*) and practical will, both of which are shown to be ultimately grounded in freedom. The 1830 “feeling soul” section begins with a short introduction (§§403 – 404) before being divided into three subsections: (i) the feeling soul in its immediacy (§§405 – 406); (ii) self-feeling (§§407 – 408) and habit (§§409-410), which will not be discussed here.

Although the actual content of §§ 403 to 408 remains largely unaltered between the second and third editions, along with the change of heading from dreaming to feeling soul, Hegel does make several discrete additions or substitutions that serve to further accentuate the new emphasis on feeling. Notably, the term “feeling” (*fühlen* and its derivatives) is substituted for the earlier “sentient” (*empfinden* and its derivatives) in the main texts of §§ 403 - 406. In the same sense, the sub-heading for § 405 is changed from “The Passive Totality of the Individual” (1827) to “The Soul that feels in its immediacy” (1830), and its remark is lengthened to include new reflections on feeling.

To understand where the dreaming soul comes from, it is necessary to return to a far earlier Hegel text, his 1794 manuscript on psychology (MS), to which Hoffmeister gave the appropriate title of “Materien [building blocks] zu einer Philosophie des subjektiven Geistes”.³ Although the possible relation between the early manuscript on psychology and the mature editions of the PSS is noted by Petry, in his 1978 translation of the work,⁴ substantial investigation into the MS as a source of Hegel’s later work has remained neglected. Perhaps this is because of the non-discursive, fragmentary nature of the untranslated manuscript, the fact it is largely written in point-form, with many abbreviations. It is nonetheless remarkable that much of the content of the dreaming or feeling soul section of the mature PSS appears to reprise the contents of a text penned by Hegel thirty-six years before subjective spirit’s ultimate expression. What is even more remarkable is that the seminal text was actually composed by someone other than Hegel. I will return to the crucial question of provenance later. For now, let us look briefly at the content of the 1794 MS and compare it with the later editions of the PSS. This will not only establish the early manuscript as a source, it will also shed light on the origins of the dreaming soul, and help us understand why it is replaced by feeling in the 1830 edition of the Encyclopedia.

Although the 1794 MS is pregnant with references to psychological theoreticians of the time, such as Abel, Schmidt, Jakob and Garve, identified by Hoffmeister’s impressive scholarship in his *Dokumente zu Hegels Entwicklung*, the MS appears, above

³ An early edition of the 1794 MS can be found in Hoffmeister, *Dokumente zu Hegels Entwicklung* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Fromman-Holzboog, 1974 [1936]) pp. 194 – 217. Cf the later critical edition, which I will also refer to, Hegel, *Gesammelte Werke, Herausgegeben von der Rheinische-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Bd. I, Friedhelm Nicolin, Gisela Schüler (eds.) (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1989) [= GW I] pp. 165 – 192.

⁴ M. J. Petry, *Hegel’s Philosophy of Subjective Spirit*, (bilingual edition) Edited and translated with an introduction and explanatory notes (Dordrecht/Boston: D. Reidel, 1979 [1978]) p. 1 (Introduction p. 50).

all, born under the sign of Kant's transcendental esthetic, through his interpreters J. Schultze and Karl Reinhold. The latter's contribution explains why the first part of the MS deals with the mind as productive of representations (*Vorstellungen*), either as representations of sentience (*Empfindungsvorstellungen*), derived from the five outer senses or as representations from the inner life of the human organism. The latter enable us to feel inner changes, inner states, to have "self-feeling (*Gefühl unsrer Selbst* – line 141 in Hoffmeister)" and include "representations from the soul, not worked on by consciousness". The "fundamental power of the soul [*Seele*]"⁵ to generate unbidden, raw representations is the question that occupies the entire middle section of the manuscript, from about lines 150 to 540 in Hoffmeister's edition, whereupon the section on the understanding (*Verstand*) and its concepts puts an abrupt end to the soul's representations of Phantasie⁶. The MS's central project concerns how to rationally explain the unconscious resurgence (*Wiedererweckung*) of forgotten, outer-produced representations and of unbidden inner representations. While the understanding will actively recall inner, conserved representations through remembrance (*Erinnerung*), this does not explain the resurgence of representations "ohne Erinnerung", as experienced, for example, by the sleepwalker or the cataleptic.⁷

The underlying goal of the central part of the 1794 MS, the part that pertains to the question raised in this paper, is consequently an attempt to impose reason on the unreasonable, to assign rational causes to the irrational manifestations of the soul. If we can establish what brings about spontaneous representations of the imagination or Phantasie, we may control them. The MS presents a number of possible laws and causes

⁵ GW I, 172, lines 6, 14.

⁶ GW I, 173, line 10.

⁷ GW I, 172, lines 17 - 18.

for the unbidden resurgence of representations (lines 217 – 300 Hoffmeister)⁸. The explanations include deformation of the brain, physical illness (hypochondria), fever, passion, light and darkness, weather and drunkenness. The general cause favored by MS, however, is a weakening of conscious memory (*Gedächtnis*), brought on by illness (lines 280 – 293 Hoffmeister)⁹. In sickness, weakened consciousness is “overpowered” by the soul and its “arbitrary” representations, now forming delusional trains of thought according to Phantasie’s own “laws of association”.¹⁰

Those familiar with the articulations of the PSS will have already recognized common elements in the 1794 MS. The characterization of the soul as self-feeling is echoed in the content and heading of PSS § 407 (*Selbstgefühl*). The idea of the soul as an unstable store of preserved inner and outer-generated images prefigures the “indeterminate pit (*Schacht*)” that forms the soul of each individual, in PSS § 403, and which is the source of dreams, illusions and madness. Above all, the conflictual nature of the relation between conscious mind and the “laws of Phantasie” (line 286 Hoffmeister)¹¹, where any weakening on the part of the former allows dominance by the latter, is clearly echoed in the 1830 edition of PSS § 405, where Hegel presents the pathological state of *Gemüt* as arising from an unnatural predominance of the soul over rational subjectivity.¹² As well, in the 1794 MS, the soul already displays a recalcitrant, stubborn nature, a tendency to fixate on ideas and resist change, only accepting “the new”

⁸ GW I, 175 – 177, line 19.

⁹ Ibid, line 3 – 13.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid. 177, line 8.

¹² The remark to § 405 in the 1830 edition is substantially longer than in 1827, reflecting its new heading: “The feeling soul in its immediacy”, which replaces “The passive totality of the individual”. This new heading and the added content on feeling is coherent with the section’s change of title, which I am discussing, in § 403. The lengthened remark represents one of the more significant differences between the two editions and reflects the new emphasis on feeling as opposed to dreaming and thus falls under the subject of this paper.

through “unpleasant exercise [and] habit” (line 173 Hoffmeister)¹³, an idea the PSS introduces in § 409.¹⁴ On a broader scale, one might also argue that the 1794 MS’s stark juxtaposition between the dream-like imaginings of the unconscious soul and the immediately subsequent section on conscious understanding is later developed into the dialectical transition between anthropology and psychology that Hegel presents in the PSS’s Phenomenology section.

This is not the place to examine all the differences between the 1794 MS and the mature versions of the PSS as a whole, for example, the fact the MS puts representation in the context of anthropology, rather than presenting it, along with intuition, as a function of conscious mind or that the MS goes on to evoke such apparently extraneous Kantian elements as reflective esthetic judgments and cosmology. Nor is there space to discuss further parallels in content, for example, the MS’s references to *Phantasie* as productive of literary discourse (*Dichtungskraft*) and the understanding’s capacity to produce linguistic signs, discussions taken up in the PSS § 458.¹⁵ Now, I want to focus on the section within the MS that concerns me most, where Hegel most clearly finds the building blocks (*Materien*) for his later discussion of the dreaming soul, which will become the feeling soul, in 1830.

¹³ GW I, 173, line 9

¹⁴ The section I am discussing from the 1827 and 1830 editions of the PSS can be found in the 1817 edition, from 320 to 326, where Hegel presents many of the same mental particularities (somnambulism, dreaming, clairvoyance etc.) and habit, found in the last editions of the PSS and which can be traced back to the MS. It is perhaps worth mentioning that none of this material can be found in the 1822 fragment on anthropology (translated in Williams and in Petry), nor, as Petry points out, in any of the “spirit” material from the pre-Phenomenological Jena period. I would simply add that, in the 1822 fragment, Hegel does refer to the “self-sentient soul” (*sich empfindende Seele*) in terms of a power struggle between the soul (which cannot control itself) and free, self-controlling consciousness. As I mentioned, this is both the theme of the central part of the MS and of the later dreaming/feeling soul section of the PSS. See Petry, I, pp. 134-35.

¹⁵ § 380, in 1817 edition.

The section that I am particularly interested in runs from lines 363 to 538 in Hoffmeister's *Dokumente zu Hegels Entwicklung*¹⁶ and immediately follows the lines that I have just been discussing, on the reasons and laws governing the spontaneous resurgence of the soul's representations. The section is entitled, "Use on certain conditions where *Phantasie* takes part: Dreams, Somnambulism, madness (*Verrückung*)¹⁷ premonitions, visions". In fact, the text actually begins with a subsection entitled "Sleep", includes references to clairvoyance as well as to premonition and ends with a final sub-titled section on religious fervor (*Schwärmerei*) and enthrallment (*Enthusiasmus*). The content found in this well-defined section of the 1794 MS is all covered in the PSS's Dreaming/feeling Soul sub-chapter, in §§ 403 to 408, and particularly in §§ 405 and 406.¹⁸ This correspondence is, of course, more obvious in the 1827 edition, where Hegel still refers to dreaming, which is, as mentioned above, an actual heading in the 1794 MS. Furthermore, at the end of § 390 of the 1827 edition, Hegel still refers to the following section (from §§ 391 to 402) as dealing with "the sleeping soul", a reference that is dropped in favor of "the natural soul", in the 1830 edition. In other words, the 1827 edition clearly displays the mature PSS's (*both* editions') debt to the 1794 MS, in which the sleeping soul is presented as a condition where *Phantasie* has free play, bringing forth both clear and obscure representations that are easily confused with ones derived from the senses. The sleeping soul of the MS is one that hears and sees things that are not there. It dreams, walks in its sleep, which may be

¹⁶ Hoffmeister, *Dokumente*, pp. 205 – 210. GW I, pp. 179 – 184.

¹⁷ GW I, p. 179. Cf: Hoffmeister who reads the manuscript as *Verzückung* (rapture) which does not fit with the actual content of the section.

¹⁸ § 408 reflects, to a greater extent, later influences and readings, for example, in the *Zusatz*, Philippe Pinel's seemingly arbitrary theoretical nosography of mental illness (1798, 1803, 1807 etc.) is reorganized and "conceptualized" here by Hegel.

“magnetic” (line 434 Hoffmeister)¹⁹; it may become melancholy, mad or deranged, have premonitions or visions and may even fall into the worst excesses of religious fervor. Significantly, these “*Zustände* (conditions)” are pathological, not because sleeping and dreaming are, in themselves, symptomatic of illness, but because they represent a state where conscious “power over the imagination” (*Macht über die Einbildungskraft*)²⁰ is lost. It is the pathological divagations of the dreaming soul that come to an abrupt halt, when it is snapped awake at the end of this passage, by the stark, unyielding title of the following MS section: *Verstand*. Similarly, in PSS’s §§ 403 to 408, the dreaming/feeling soul is one whose “determinations are not developed in conscious content arising from the understanding”.²¹ In fact, as Hegel puts it in the § 404 remark, we are clearly dealing with a pathological “condition [*Zustand*] where the development of the soul, having already arrived at [. . .] consciousness and understanding may once again relapse.”²² The mature PSS’s presentation of dreaming, somnambulism, folly, premonitions, visions and religious fervor as pathological states appears to be derived from the “building blocks” of

¹⁹ GWI, p. 181, line 15.

²⁰ GW I, p. 181 line 3. In the mature PSS magnetism is ambiguously presented as both an illness and a cure. Besides the dialectical truth of this fact (i.e. the addition of more negativity, i.e. of sickness, overcomes the sickness and effectuates the cure), the curative properties of magnetism are probably inspired by Hegel’s reading of the works of the Marquis de Puységur, who is much more interested in this aspect than is his mentor, Antoine Mesmer. Puységur’s *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire et à l’établissement du magnétisme animal* were published in 1785.

²¹ At the beginning of the § 404 remark. My translation.

²² This passage provides a seldom remarked key to Hegel’s discussion of psychopathology. It is thought of in terms of a regression, and it is only as such, as pathology, that these “abstract configurations” of the soul become for us. In other words, Hegel is not saying that the development of human consciousness necessarily passes through madness and then is cured. He is saying that the unconscious level of the soul is always present and because of its power, represents a possible condition into which rational mind may relapse. As well, Hegel seems to be saying, in the same remark, that it is through observation of these relapses in other minds that science is able to study the unconscious soul. Hegel explicitly recognizes a fact now taken for granted in psychiatry: knowledge of the mind is developed through study of human psychopathologies. There has been much recent interest in Hegel’s theory of madness. English language studies include: Daniel Berthold-Bond, *Hegel’s Theory of Madness* (Albany: SUNY press, 1995); Kirk Pillow, “Habituating Madness and Phantasying Art in Hegel’s Encyclopedia”, *Owl of Minerva*, 28.2, pp.183-215; Jon Mills, *The Unconscious Abyss: Hegel’s Anticipation of Psychoanalysis* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002).

the 1794 MS. The 1827 edition's references to the sleeping and dreaming soul make this particularly evident. However, another, more peculiar shared reference establishes the MS's paternity, beyond any doubt.

In the 1794 MS, at the beginning of the section on sleep, there appears the single word, or rather name "Haller", followed by the words, "incapacity to move freely".²³ I suspected the text referred to the famous 18th Century physician Albrecht von Haller but could not grasp the reference nor see what it had to do with the topic treated: how our imagined representations may actually be clearer, more distinct than our empirical ones. In fact, the name Haller appears again in the 1827-8 lecture notes, recently translated by Robert Williams, however not in the principal Erdmann manuscript but in the Walter notes from the same lectures, which Williams helpfully adds in footnotes. The Walter notes add an even more enigmatic reference, writing, "Haller and the glass leg."²⁴ The lengthy Boumann *Zusatz* to PSS § 408 also refers to "someone who imagined he had glass feet [being] cured by the staging of a pretended robbery".²⁵ Googling "Haller and glass feet or legs" will give you some very strange results, but it will not give you the solution to the enigma, which is found in Petry's translation of the PSS, specifically in the lecture notes taken by Griesheim and Kehler, in the subjective spirit lectures of 1825.²⁶ Here, we discover that Dr. Haller in Göttingen (therefore indeed Albrecht von Haller) cured a patient who believed he was incapable of movement because he believed he had glass legs, by having some of Haller's students attack him and his patient while the two were riding in a carriage. Haller ran off; the patient did likewise and was thus

²³ GW I, p. 179, line 19.

²⁴ Williams, p.152, n.269. Another reference is found in Walter's notes on p. 145 n. 236, referring to "feet of glass."

²⁵ Petry p.383.

²⁶ Petry, vol. 2, p.385.

cured. Incidentally, the fact that the Erdmann manuscript chooses not to include what may simply be taken as a colorful anecdote occults the fact that much of the content of the PSS Anthropology *Zusätze* is inspired by writings in what was known at the time as empirical psychology. I will return to this a little later. For now, it is enough to have proven that Hegel used the 1794 manuscript on psychology more than thirty years after transcribing it, in his lectures accompanying the *Encyclopedia*, at least as late as 1827.

Other discrete references in the 1794 MS can be found in the PSS. However, once again, this is not the place to embark on a detailed analysis of the specific content of the MS in order to elucidate the corresponding content of the PSS. Besides influencing Hegel in his determination of the above-mentioned dream states as pathological conditions, it is the general context of the MS that reveals an essential aspect of the mature PSS, one that will finally explain the move from “dreaming” to “feeling” soul. This aspect is discovered in the fact that both the MS and the PSS consider the same mental pathologies as arising from a power struggle between rational understanding and the imagination, where the former loses its mastery and is overcome. The pertinence of this struggle, however, only becomes clear if we return to a question left in suspense above, i.e. the question of provenance. Where does the 1794 MS come from and what do its origins signify? This is important because the origins of the MS are ultimately those of important parts of the PSS.

The editors of the critical *Gesammelte Werke*, having analyzed the MS’s handwriting and the paper’s watermark, conclude it was penned while Hegel was in Bern, probably in 1794.²⁷ However, Hoffmeister had already speculated that the actual content of the MS was derived from a course Hegel had taken while at Tübingen, from someone

²⁷ GW I, pp. 483 – 487.

in the “Abel’schen Kreis”.²⁸ Referring to the testimonial of Hegel’s fellow student Betzendörfer, Hoffmeister supposes the source of the MS to have been the Tübingen professor J. F. Flatt, whose course in empirical psychology Hegel followed, in 1789/90.²⁹ The MS on psychology therefore seems to be the later transcription of course notes that Hegel took while attending Flatt’s lecture four or five years earlier. This supposition seems confirmed by Dieter Henrich, who in 1964 discovered the course notes of Friedrich Klüpfel, another fellow Tübingen student of Hegel’s who also took Flatt’s course in 1790.³⁰ The content of the Klüpfel course notes is virtually identical to most of the 1794 psychology MS, including that portion of the manuscript under discussion here that deals with the pathological imaginings of the sleeping and dreaming soul and which informs, I have shown, the mature PSS. This means that much of the inspiration for PSS §§ 403 to 408, on the dreaming/feeling soul, actually comes from J. F. Flatt.³¹

Such a conclusion may be unsettling and even distasteful to those who see Flatt as the “Scrooge of Tübingen”, as Frederick Beiser calls him in his *Fate of Reason*.³² Flatt is best known as the assistant of the dogmatic theology professor G. C. Storr, famous for his anachronistic and quixotic defense of orthodox religion and the literal truth (i.e. Revelation) of the Bible, the Trinity and miracles, in the face of the Kantian critiques.

²⁸ Hoffmeister, p. 453.

²⁹ The course was officially listed as either “empiricam psychologicam” or “Psych. empiricam” in the Tübingen course calendar. GW I, pp. 484 – 85.

³⁰ The fact that Rozenkranz makes no mention of having found a Hegel notebook from Flatt’s course has led some to surmise that such a notebook did not exist and therefore that Hegel must have borrowed the notes from another fellow student, F. H. Mögling, who was also a house tutor in Bern around 1794. However, H. S. Harris’s explanation for the fact Rozenkranz doesn’t mention finding Hegel’s course notes for Flatt’s course is convincingly elegant: Hegel had simply thrown out his notes after having transcribed what he wanted from them, in 1794! H. S. Harris, *Hegel’s Development*, vol.1, p.83 n.1, p.84 n. See also GW I, pp. 484-85. The editors of the GW volume helpfully include the text from Klüpfel’s notes in the Anmerkungen section.

³¹ Hoffmeister, in *Dokumente*, analyzes the multitudinous references in the 1794 MS and recognizes Flatt as synthesizing them into lecture notes.

³² Frederick C. Beiser, *The Fate of Reason* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), p. 210.

Surely, both Flatt and Storr are included in the disparaging remarks Hegel and Schelling share in their correspondence of late 1794 and early 1795, on the poor state of theology at Tübingen. However, as Beiser himself points out, there are, in fact, two Flatts, the “reactionary” professor of theology, defender of supernaturalism³³ and the earlier version, a champion of Leibnizian/Wolffian late Enlightenment reason, against Kant’s critique of metaphysical thought. In his famous polemical reviews of Kant’s work (1788 and 1789)³⁴, Flatt is arguing for the objective reality of transcendent causation and the consequent possibility for a cosmological proof of the existence of God. In other words, Flatt defends the Enlightenment reason of Leibniz, Wolff and Mendelssohn against the limitations imposed by Kant’s first critique. It is this J. F. Flatt who put together the lecture notes on empirical psychology. My contention is consequently that the PSS section on the dreaming/feeling soul, which Hegel derives from Flatt’s 1790 lecture, is thoroughly informed by Flatt’s Enlightenment project, the defense of reason against its perceived opposite: the excessive claims of Phantasie, including somnambulism, premonitions, clairvoyance and religious fervor (Schwärmerei, as a form of mental illness).

The PSS section on the dreaming/feeling soul is a particularly clear expression of this Enlightenment project championed by the early Flatt, because that section corresponds so well to the part of the 1794 MS under discussion, entitled “Use on certain conditions where Phantasie plays a part”. What is being *used* here is empirical

³³ “Reactionary” is from Beiser, p. 11. The supernaturalism of Storr/Flatt used Kant’s first critique in a tendentious way: Because the noumenal realm is beyond empirical knowledge, its content must be known by Revelation.

³⁴ In other words, while he was preparing his lectures on empirical psychology, he wrote his *Fragmentarische Beyträge zur Bestimmung und Deduktion des Begriffs und Grundsätze der Causalität* and the *Briefe über den moralischen Erkenntnisgrund der Religion*. See Beiser, p.211- 14.

psychology and the goal of this application is to show that these supposedly exalted, paranormal conditions may be explained scientifically and reasonably, as pathologies. This becomes evident when we understand where Flatt found the material for this discrete section. Curiously, this is the one section of the MS where Hoffmeister, in his exhaustive analysis of its diverse references, renounces finding a source.

In fact, a clue to discovering Flatt's source for this section can be found, although someone circuitously, in a case of *Seelenkrankheit* referred to in the addition to PSS § 406.³⁵ In the *Zusatz*, Hegel mentions a case of a soldier who deserted his post and hurried to his mother in a town some distance away, because he had the clear premonition that she was "being tied up by robbers". Although this case attained some notoriety in late 18th Century Prussia, probably because the soldier was only lightly punished,³⁶ I found the original account in C. P. Moritz's *Magazin zur Erfahrungsseelenkunde*, a popular review published in Berlin between 1783 and 1793. While the *Magazin* may possibly claim the title of first journal of psychiatry, it is certainly the first journal of anthropology, as Hegel understands that science in the PSS.³⁷ An original Moritz footnote to this account (*Desertion aus einem unbekanntem Bewegungsgrunde*) is highly revealing of the *Magazin*'s overall mission and its impact on Hegel's PSS, through Flatt's course material on the dreaming soul. In his note, Moritz explains that such accounts of visions or clairvoyance are symptomatic of a "sick condition of the soul", where it is allowed to express its natural qualities too strongly. Although the *Magazin* regularly presents speculations on the nature of the soul and reflections on "speech from a

³⁵ Petry p. 291.

³⁶ See Petry p. 545.

³⁷ All 13 volumes have been edited by Petra and Uwe Nettelbeck and published by Franz Greno (Nördlingen, 1986). For the case in question, see volume 2, pp. 17 – 18. Petry presents a helpful list of contemporary German works on anthropology, vol. 1. pp. 63 – 66 (introduction).

psychological point of view”, most of the volumes are dedicated to recounting testimonials of dreams, nightmares, somnambulism, as well as what we might call parapsychological or even paranormal experiences. Most significantly, the *Magazin* then brings these cases into the realm of scientific explanation, debunking them, one might say, by presenting them in terms of pathology, in order that we may reasonably know those aspects of the self that seem to lie beyond reason.³⁸ The often colorful, highly subjective anecdotes and accounts are the stuff of empirical psychology or empirical anthropology, in the sense of the journal’s scientific concept of *Erfahrungsseelenkunde*. The picturesque examples that nourish a number of the PSS’s *Zuzätze* are drawn from the *Magazin* and other similar sources. In spite of all the obvious qualities of Erdmann’s 1827 lecture notes, his philosophical decision to concentrate exclusively on Hegel’s conceptual discourse while leaving out the empirical psychology material is not without consequence. We thus tend to forget the intellectual impetus that motivates these sources: the late Enlightenment’s struggle against supernatural religious fervor, enthrallment and fanaticism, taken together under the term *Schärmerei*. In empirical psychology, in Flatt’s lecture and the 1794 MS, as well as in the mature PSS, this struggle is played out within the human psyche, in the constant power struggle between rational understanding and the dreaming soul, that defines sanity and madness.³⁹

³⁸ The full title of the *Magazin* is actually, Gnothi sauton (in Greek letters = know yourself) oder *Magazin zur...* etc.

³⁹ Another sign of Hegel’s interest in empirical psychology around the time he copied out his Flatt lecture notes to form the 1794 manuscript is his request, at the end of his Christmas Eve 1794 letter to Schelling that his friend have the “review of Mauchart’s *Repertorium*” sent to him in Berne. Mauchart was a former teaching assistant at the Tübingen Stift. His *Allgemeines Repertorium für empirische Psychologie* (1792 sqq) was a journal very similar in content and motivation to Moritz’s *Magazin*. Perhaps Hegel’s earliest sign of an interest in *Seelenkunde* is the excerpt he copied from Campe’s “*kleine Seelenlehre für Kinder*” in October, 1786. See Hoffmeister, *Dokumente*, p. 101.

Flatt's 1789/90 lectures on empirical psychology were certainly inspired by the *Magazin's* late Enlightenment mission of using "modern" anthropology to show that the excess of Phantasie, and particularly, the manifestations of *Schwärmerei*, are pathological conditions of the soul. In this light, it should be no surprise that Mendelssohn served as an early advisor to the review.⁴⁰ If indeed Hegel's 1794 MS is inspired, through Flatt, by this aspect of the Enlightenment project, and if the MS informs the mature PSS, then it may also be useful in explaining the move from the dreaming soul to the feeling soul, which takes place in the mature PSS between the 1827 and 1830 editions. My hypothesis is that Hegel espouses the Enlightenment dimension of the section on the sleeping and dreaming soul in his struggle against the *Gefühlsreligion* of his Berlin rival, the theologian Schleiermacher. In other words, the religion of feeling can now be seen as a type of *Schwärmerei* and thus as a pathological condition of the dreaming soul. Reference to Schleiermacher's religion of feeling in this section would explain the changing of the section's title to "the feeling soul" and the attendant alterations to the section's content.

Much has been written on the Hegel-Schleiermacher conflict at Berlin, and this is not the place to revisit it.⁴¹ In order to support the likelihood of my idea that Hegel makes the change from "dreaming" to "feeling" as a result of this conflict, it is necessary

⁴⁰ See the informative doctoral thesis on the *Magazin* by Kim, Soo-Jung, *Vorhersehungsvermögen und Taubstummheit : Zwei Aspekte der Leib/Seele-Problematik in Karl Philipp Moritz' "Magazin zur Erfahrungsseelenkunde"* (Kiel: Christian-Albrechts-Universität, 2001). On Mendelssohn, see p. 15. Another late Enlightenment figure is pivotal in the understanding of mental illness as a struggle between reason and unreason: Kant's well-read "*Von der Macht des Gemüts durch den blossen Vorsatz seiner krankhaften Gefühle Meister zu sein*", published in periodicals in 1796, and again in his *Conflict of the Faculties*. This work, as well as Kant's pre-critical (1770) essay "*Versuch über die Krankheiten des Kopfes*" are often neglected by philosophers writing on Hegel's theory of madness.

⁴¹ See, for example, Jeffrey Hoover, "The Origin of the Conflict Between Hegel and Schleiermacher at Berlin," *The Owl of Minerva*, 20.1 (1988), pp. 69-79 and Eric Von Der Luft, *Hegel, Hinrichs and Schleiermacher on Feeling and Religion* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press, 1987).

to show three things: 1) that Hegel associates Schleiermacher with expressions of feeling, 2) that Schleiermacher's religion of feeling is referred to in the PSS section on the feeling soul, 3) that Hegel had a Schleiermacher-related reason to change the title of the section between 1827 and 1830.

1) Although Hegel refers to Schleiermacher, or to his writings, in his early essays, the *Difference Between the Systems of Fichte and Schelling* (1801) and *Faith and Knowing* (1802), and briefly in the *Philosophy of Right* (1820), his main and most polemical treatment of his Berlin colleague and rival is found in the Preface Hegel wrote to H. F. W. Hinrichs' *Philosophy of Religion* (1822). Tracing the trajectory of these references, it may be argued that the evolution of Hegel's attitude toward Schleiermacher follows the latter's own progression from a religion of intuition, an expression he uses in the first edition of the *Speeches on Religion*, to a religion of feeling, a term he introduces in later editions of the *Speeches* and develops fully in his *Dogmatics*⁴² (1821) where the essence of religion is defined as the feeling of dependency toward God. In parallel, Hegel moves from a position of Schelling-influenced intellectual intuition, not entirely dissimilar to Schleiermacher's early idea of religion as an intuition of the universe, to a mature position where intuition tends to be assimilated into feeling, which is thought of as subjective, arbitrary and, above all, thoroughly natural. The progression of Hegel's own thought in this area consequently allows him to caricature Schleiermacher's mature thought as revealing what it has been from its very origins, a religion of natural, subjective feeling. Thus, Hegel is able to famously write, in the Preface to Hinrichs'

⁴² *Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt*. In anticipation of the publication, Hegel writes to Daub (May 9, 1821), "One can pay with markers for a long time, but sooner or later one must pull out one's purse. Will not more markers fall from that purse? We shall see!"

Religion, “If, in man, religion is based entirely on feeling [...] the dog would then be the best Christian, for the dog [...] lives mainly within feeling”, and further on, “[a] dog also has feelings of redemption when its hunger is satisfied by a bone.”⁴³ The central argument of the Preface consists in a genealogical demonstration that presents Schleiermacher’s religion of feeling as symptomatic of a contemporary malaise, where modern cultures of empiricism and skepticism have fostered the belief that feeling is the only way to experience the truth.

2) How does religion and more specifically, the religion of feeling appear as a form of mental pathology, in the dreaming/feeling soul section of the PSS? As mentioned above, the final part of the dreaming soul section of the 1794 MS deals with religious fervor and enthusiasm, a fact that is perfectly coherent with the pro-Enlightenment aspect of the MS’s source. As the MS already puts it, the “religious pretension” of having access to “supernatural sources of knowledge” (*übernaturalische Erkenntnisquellen*) is, in fact, a form of “natural and transcendent ignorance.” There is no mention of religious feeling in the MS because what will later be described as *Gefühl* and its pretension to immediate, absolute knowledge of the divine is, in 1794, still assigned to the delusional representations of Phantasie. Nonetheless, early religious fantasy shares with the later expression of *Gefühl* the character of naturalness, regarding both origin and pathological morbidity. Thus, in the MS, the cause of the *Schwärmerei* condition is either an “irritability of the organs” or an “over-stimulation of the imagination”, and, in its worst excesses, morbid religious fanaticism actually leads to murder (lines 532 – 538 Hoffmeister).⁴⁴ This natural aspect of *Schwärmerei* is clearly

⁴³ Hegel, *Werke in 20 Bänden*, vol. 11, p. 58.

⁴⁴ GW I, p. 184, lines 10 – 15.

echoed in Hegel's Preface to Hinrichs' Religion, where the practitioner of the religion of feeling (i.e. Schleiermacher) is repeatedly described as "the natural man" who claims to know God "without knowing anything at all."⁴⁵

Feeling, takes on increased importance between the 1827 and the 1830 editions of the PSS, as reflected in the change of title at § 403. In the 1827 PSS, Hegel does not make the distinction between sentience (*Empfindung*) and feeling (*Gefühl*). As we find articulated in the Erdmann lecture notes, "There is no great distinction to be made between sentience and feeling".⁴⁶ However, in § 402 of the 1830 edition, Hegel does come to make this distinction, which then allows him to introduce the new feeling-related section headings in that same edition: "the feeling soul" (§ 403), "the feeling soul in its immediacy" (§ 405, where he also substantially lengthens the Remark, on feeling) and to replace the term "sentient" with "feeling" twice in § 407 (self-feeling). In a lengthy and instructive note, Williams provides a commentary on Hegel's later distinction between *Empfindung* and *Gefühl*.⁴⁷

Williams remarks that Hegel regards *Gefühl* as more active than the other concept. Hence, Williams associates *Selbstgefühl* with the first inchoate articulations of self-consciousness or "self-awareness"⁴⁸, thereby down-playing the essential natural, animal aspect of the concept. It should be mentioned, however, that the main distinction that Hegel makes between the terms is one of origin, with *Empfindung* referring to external sense-derived sentience and *Gefühl* relating to inner-derived feelings.⁴⁹ As we

⁴⁵ *Werke* 11, pp. 58, 61. As Von der Luft points out, the reference to natural man is from Luther's translation of the Bible, 1 Cor. 2:14.

⁴⁶ Robert Williams, p. 110.

⁴⁷ Williams, p. 110 n. 94.

⁴⁸ This is how Petry translates *Selbstgefühl*, thereby losing all its natural connotations.

⁴⁹ See § 403 : "Soul, as feeling, is an individuality no longer simply natural but interior."

see in the Preface to Hinrichs' *Religion*, feeling, like sentience, remains natural. In the 1830 PSS, this natural quality of interior feeling is assured by its intimate bond to *Leiblichkeit* (bodilyness).⁵⁰ As well, while self-feeling may mark the first instance of self-distinguishing necessary for subsequent differentiation in consciousness, Hegel presents it as an immediate, "magical" division or judgment (*Urteilen*, as original dividing), which is inherently unstable in its lack of syllogistic mediation. This is why self-feeling is open to derangement, alienation and madness.⁵¹

References to religion in the 1827 Erdmann lecture notes on the dreaming soul section of the PSS deal with *Schwärmerei* in the form of enthrallment and fanaticism. In these notes, Hegel refers to the surprising fact, gleaned from Pinel's Parisian experiences, that one fourth to one fifth of all those in mental asylums suffer from religious delusions.⁵² These references in Erdmann's notes are found in the paragraphs immediately preceding the discussion of "Habit" (PSS § 409) and thus correspond perfectly to the position of the subsection on *Schwärmerei* in the last part of the dreaming soul section of the 1794 MS. As well, Walter's notes from the 1827 lectures actually echo the MS's reference to religious fanaticism and murder.⁵³ However, it is important to see that by 1827, Hegel apparently considers the *Phantasievorstellungen* of religious fanaticism as either marginal or largely a thing of the past. They are not mentioned in the

⁵⁰ § 404 Remark.

⁵¹ Here, as elsewhere, Hegel shows himself to be the great reconciler of two opposing contemporary scientific visions. The bond between the feeling soul and bodilyness allows Hegel to grasp mental illness as both physically derived (hypochondriac, for men, hysterical, for women, according to the scientific traditions of the day) and morally (psychically) caused, according to Pinel. The earlier German theoretician, G.E. Stahl, advocates a position similar to Hegel's: mental illness is the result of "an abnormal relationship between mind and body." Ilza Veith, *Hysteria, The History of a Disease* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965) p. 187.

⁵² Williams, p. 147. The reference Williams discovers is to Pinel, whose work was very influential (as was Puysegur's) in the development of Hegel's mature PSS.

⁵³ Williams p. 147 n. 250.

body of the *Encyclopedia* text and are only alluded to briefly in the accompanying lectures. In this sense, Griesheim's notes (1825) refer to it being "no longer the case" that "a lot of people" suffer from mental derangement through "religious representations (*Vorstellungen*)". This does not mean, however, that religious delusion has disappeared. It has merely changed form. The pathologies of religious fervor, of *Schärmerei*, originally discussed in the 1794 MS as conditions of the dreaming soul, are now present in the contemporary culture of feeling, whose perfect expression is found in Schleiermacher's *Gefühlsreligion*.⁵⁴ "Life in feeling", writes Hegel in § 406 of the 1830 edition, "as a form or state of the self-conscious, cultivated man, is a sickness where the individual relates immediately to his own concrete content". This is a form of folly or derangement because the "feeling individual" as "simple ideality" (§ 403), is, in fact, feeling his own particularity. He thinks he has an intuition of the universe, when he is actually only feeling himself; he is thus symptomatic of "the perversion, the particular arrogance and absolute egoism that have surfaced in our time."⁵⁵

Above all, Schleiermacher's religion of feeling is an affront to reason and science. It betrays "an animal ignorance (*tierische Unwissenheit*)", as Hegel writes in the Preface to Hinrichs' *Religion*.⁵⁶ The fact that precisely the same term (*Unwissenheit*) is found in the 1794 MS, with reference to *Schärmerei*, at the end of the section on the dreaming soul⁵⁷ not only reveals the late Enlightenment source of Hegel's critique, it is also an

⁵⁴ In *Faith and Knowing*, Hegel already describes Schleiermacher as a "exponential" expression (*Potenzierung*) of Jacobi. *Werke* vol.2, p.391.

⁵⁵ Preface to Hinrichs' *Philosophy of Religion*. Hegel, *Werke* 11, p. 60. To the extent Hegel associates Schleiermacher with the mental pathology of feeling, he is symptomatic of a generalized social condition.

⁵⁶ *Werke* 11, p. 65.

⁵⁷ GW I, p. 184, line 15. Hoffmeister, *Dokumente*, line 537

indication that Schleiermacher's religion of feeling should be understood as a privileged manifestation of the mental pathology Hegel comes to call feeling.

3) Finally, what happened between 1827 and 1830 that would make Hegel want to change the heading of § 403 from "dreaming soul" to "feeling soul", and to clearly distinguish feeling from sentience, as a form of mental derangement? The answer, I believe, is found in Hegel's correspondence from the fall of 1829. Letters between Hegel and several of his collaborators on the *Journal of Scientific Criticism* reveal Hegel's preoccupation with recent critical attacks against the 1827 edition of his *Encyclopedia*. He clearly associates these attacks with Schleiermacher. "It seems the [anonymous] Letters Against the Encyclopedia are from Schleiermacher," he writes in a letter to Daub, on September 27, 1829. In his response on October 11, Daub writes that he also supposed the anonymous author to be Schleiermacher. A letter from Rust, on October 7, 1829, in which he excuses himself for not yet having delivered his critical review of several dogmatic works from the Schleiermacher camp, refers to fighting "with sharp weapons the pretensions and arrogance of the school of feeling [*Gefühlsschule*]", promising to "expose the pathetic activity of the Pietists and superficial theologians." Consequently, it is safe to say that Hegel revised the 1827 edition of the *Encyclopedia* at a time when he felt it was under attack by Schleiermacher and his *Gefühlsschule*. What better response than to let the object of the attack, the *Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*, show his rival's position to be not only deeply unscientific but symptomatic of a delusional feeling soul?⁵⁸ The formulation of such a response is perfectly consistent with the pro-

⁵⁸ The 1829 *Jarbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* (# 10) announces a review, by Hegel, of the "Letters Against the Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences", but does not include it. In the same journal, Hegel does review favorably a book of aphorisms by K. F. Götsche, and uses the occasion to reiterate many of the

Enlightenment flavor of the earlier articulations of the dreaming soul, which we discovered through the empirical psychology roots of the 1794 MS, and reason's stand against religious enthrallment and fanaticism.