



Philosophical Review

Leibniz and German Idealism

Author(s): Hiralal Haldar

Source: *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Jul., 1917), pp. 378-394

Published by: Duke University Press on behalf of Philosophical Review

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2178485>

Accessed: 25-01-2017 14:59 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Philosophical Review, *Duke University Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Philosophical Review*

LEIBNIZ AND GERMAN IDEALISM.

IT is universally acknowledged that Leibniz is the founder of German philosophy, but what is not seen, at any rate with equal clearness, is that the central conceptions of Leibniz dominate the great idealistic systems of Germany from Kant downwards. Leibniz's way of conceiving of the ultimate reality is, in essence, also that of Kant, Hegel and Lotze. To say this is not of course to maintain that the Leibnizian doctrines have been reproduced without change by his successors, but I think it is not difficult to show that if we go beneath the surface we shall find that the ideas which Leibniz introduced into modern philosophy and for which he was largely indebted to Plato have, to a considerable extent, been the determining influence of subsequent speculations. Leibniz's philosophical descendants have not rejected but retained and developed his leading thoughts. In order to show this it is necessary to begin with a brief summary of the main views of Leibniz.

The units of which the world-system is composed are the monads or spiritual principles, and each of these principles in spite of its limitations—which, however, are not external but intrinsic to it—is a complete whole and, therefore, ideates the *whole* world from its special point of view. These monads are regarded by Leibniz as absolutely cut off from and in no way influencing each other, but he is not able to retain this view to the end; and though it is not explicitly rejected, it must be regarded as virtually abandoned if we are to put any consistent meaning into his theory of the relation of God to the monads. God is the cause of the preëstablished harmony, which accounts for the correspondence between the ideas of the monads and the actual order of the world. The ideas of the monads are not merely internal modifications of them but are relative to the objective order; but as the view that the monads are independent of each other is fatal to the correlativity of the ideation of the monads and the world order, and as without such correlativity the world

would not be a rational order but a perfect chaos, Leibniz is forced to conceive of the world as related to God as an army, to use a simile of Aristotle's, is related to its general. The monads then which alone count are those that are in preëstablished harmony with and *not* in isolation from each other. This view is further enforced and developed when the distinction is made between the possible and the compossible and we are told that those monads alone are real, as distinguished from those which are merely possible, which coexist with each other as component elements of the world in which the purpose of God is realized. And, finally, even the semblance of the isolated independence of the monads is taken away when they are conceived as emanations from God. It appears then that whatever may have been the starting point of Leibniz, his final view of the world is that it is an orderly whole of interrelated reals, which are monads possessing ideas of different degrees of clearness, all comprised within the being of God who, if He transcends them, is also immanent in them and of whose mind they are the embodiment or expression.

Now the theory sketched above represents, in substance, the final form which Kant's conception of the 'thing-in-itself' assumes in the Dialectic. It is a great mistake to suppose that the Dialectic is mainly negative in its results. With the destructive criticism is intermingled a positive view of the *mundus intelligibilis* which Kant inherited from Leibniz and which he always had in mind. This view is, no doubt, put forward tentatively and more as a private conviction of the philosopher than as a theory capable of demonstration, but it had a great hold on Kant's mind. Paulsen rightly observes that Kant's metaphysics "maintains its position alongside of the official system, but it has the value only of a private opinion of Kant's with which he did not care to dispense. But one must then add that this private opinion was older than the epistemological system, and it was so deeply rooted in his thought that he would sooner have given up the Analytic than the *mundus intelligibilis*."¹

The earliest statement of Kant 'about the 'things-in-them-

¹ *Immanuel Kant: His Life and Doctrine*, English tr., p. 247.

selves' is that they are the unknown objects which affect our sensibility and produce the impressions which are the raw material of knowledge. This doctrine does not substantially differ from the crude realistic view of matter as the substratum of the qualities of things, and is utterly inconsistent with the main lessons of the Analytic. The objections to which it is open from the standpoint of the Deduction of the Categories are obvious and it is impossible to suppose that Kant was not aware of them. The fact is that the view that things out of all relation to our understanding act upon us and produce sensations in our mind is only a provisional statement to be understood in the light of what is said later on in the *Critique*. Kant often states a doctrine in a form which is least removed from the standpoint of the ordinary consciousness and then introduces modifications into it till his real meaning comes out. In the Aesthetic, for example, space is spoken of as a form of sense independent of the categories, but when we come to the Analytic, we learn that it is the sensible representation of the synthesis of homogeneous units effected by the understanding. In the same way, the apparently realistic theory that 'things-in-themselves' are the opposite of mind and act upon it from without, wears a very different aspect when we come to consider Kant's statements about the intelligible world in the Dialectic. Towards the end of the Analytic, the 'things-in-themselves,' which at the beginning look so like the unknown substance of Locke, are defined as constituting the supersensible world which surrounds and limits the world of experience to which the understanding is confined. This intelligible world, we are informed, is a *terra incognita*, "a wide and stormy ocean, the true home of illusion, where many a fog-bank and iceberg that soon melt away tempt us to believe in new lands, while constantly deceiving the adventurous mariner with vain hopes and involving him in adventures which he can never leave and yet can never bring to an end." In this vast ocean, "the country of truth," the experienced world, "is an island and enclosed by nature itself within limits that can never be changed." The function of the concept of a noumenon "is merely limitative and intended to keep the claims of sensibility

within proper bounds, therefore of negative use only." The noumenon cannot be known, because *we* are so constituted that we can only know sensible objects discursively by means of the categories, but Kant intimates to us even at this stage that what is beyond *our* understanding may nevertheless be the object of a perceptive understanding, an understanding that creates its objects in knowing them, "a process of which we could not understand even the bare possibility." But though a noumenon is incomprehensible by human intellect, the concept of it "remains not only admissible but, as a concept to limit the sphere of sensibility, indispensable."

If the concept of the noumenon serves the purpose of prescribing limits to the *mundus sensibilis*, it cannot be a merely negative concept. That in the light of which we perceive the limits of the phenomenal world, that which defines its boundaries and determines its nature, cannot itself remain entirely unknown. It is impossible to know that an island is surrounded by ocean and yet to remain wholly ignorant as to what ocean means. The light by which you see a thing cannot be invisible. From the concept of the noumenal world as that which lies beyond the objective world of experience and limits it, Kant is inevitably led to the more positive conception of noumena as Ideas of Reason which give unity to and organize experience. The vague and indeterminate 'things-in-themselves' now become transformed into concepts of reason whose function is to impart to experience "a direction towards a certain unity of which the understanding knows nothing and which is to comprehend all acts of the understanding with regard to any object into an absolute whole." The categories of the understanding constitute experience by connecting phenomena with each other, but in the world of experience so constituted the highest ideal of unity is not realized. "Our faculty of knowledge feels a higher want than merely to spell out phenomena according to their synthetic unity in order to be able to read them as experience." In the phenomenal world objects and events stand related to other objects and events and give rise only to endless series. This does not satisfy reason, which seeks to find a principle of

unity beneath the differences of objects. The aim of reason is not merely to refer the present phenomena of the world to those that precede them in the endless chain of causation, or simply to prove that the world is a whole of interconnected parts, but to trace the total system of things up to an ultimate principle revealed in it. The reason for this demand of reason is to be found in what, according to Kant, are the necessary conditions of experience itself. The purely analytical unity of the self makes experience possible by introducing its own unity into the differences of sense, and in doing so becomes synthetic. By means of its synthetic activity it constitutes the objective world in distinction from which it becomes conscious of itself as a unity. In this way, however, it so to speak loses the purity of its nature, viz.,—its undifferentiated unity with itself. To realize such a unity, therefore, becomes its ideal. On the other hand, though unity is introduced into the manifold of sense, its essential difference can not be completely overcome and this circumstance gives rise to the second Idea of Reason, viz.,—the conception of the world as an unconditioned whole. And, in the third place, the relation of the unity of the self to the experienced world suggests an all-embracing unity in which their differences are reconciled. The three Ideas of Reason, we thus see, arise from the very nature of human knowledge. As Kant says, "There is in the progression from our knowledge of ourselves (the soul) to a knowledge of the world and through it to a knowledge of the Supreme Being something so natural that it looks like the logical progression of reason from premises to conclusion."

For reasons which it is unnecessary to set forth here, Kant regards the Ideas of Reason as merely regulative and not constitutive. He does not think it possible to be sure that there are real objects corresponding to these ideas or to determine their nature. But, in spite of his agnosticism, he occasionally proceeds to lift the veil and lets us catch glimpses of the noumenal objects, though with the constant reminder that what we are thus enabled to see should not be taken too seriously. Kant, it must be remembered, is not an agnostic who maintains that it is impossible for the human mind to have any idea of the

noumenon. He *does* tell us in what sense it is possible to regard the world as an unconditioned whole and God as *ens realissimum*. All that he insists upon is that it is beyond our power to give any *proof* of the validity of these conceptions. So far as strict knowledge goes, we are unable to step beyond the world of experience.

Now the conjecture which Kant makes about the nature of the 'things-in-themselves' is that they may be intelligible principles analogous to the self. "That which forms the foundation of external phenomena and which so affects our sense as to produce in it the representations of space, matter, form, etc., if considered as a noumenon, might be at the same time the subject of thinking, although by the manner in which it affects our external sense, it produces in us no intuitions of representations, will, etc., but only of space and its determinations."¹ "The substance which, with reference to our external sense, possesses extension might very well by itself possess thoughts which can be represented consciously by its own internal sense. In such wise the same thing which in one respect is called corporeal would in another respect be at the same time a thinking being, of which, though we cannot see its thoughts, we can yet see the signs of these phenomenally."²

This idea is still further developed when Kant, in dealing with the solution of the third and fourth antinomies, argues that both the alternatives may be true but in different senses. It is possible to conceive of the phenomenal world as the expression of noumenal objects and to say that while the noumena are free causes and have necessary existence, the manifestations of them are contingent and related to each other according to the law of causality. "What in an object of the senses is not itself phenomenal, I call intelligible. If, therefore, what in the world of sense must be considered as phenomenal possesses in itself a faculty which is not the object of sensuous intuition, but through which it can become the cause of phenomena, the *causality* of that being may be considered from *two* sides, as *intelligible* in

¹ *Critique of Pure Reason*, Max Müller's tr., p. 291.

² *Ibid.*, p. 292.

its *action* as the causality of a thing by itself, and as *sensible* in the *effects* of the action, as the causality of a phenomenon in the world of sense. . . . As all phenomena, not being things by themselves, must have for their foundation a transcendental object, determining them as mere representations, there is nothing to prevent us from attributing to that transcendental object, besides the quality through which it becomes phenomenal, a *causality* also which is not phenomenal, although its effect appears in the phenomenon. Every efficient cause, however, must have a *character*, that is, a rule according to which it manifests its causality and without which it would not be a cause. According to this we should have in every subject of the world of sense, first, an *empirical character*, through which its acts, as phenomena, stand with other phenomena in an unbroken connection, according to permanent laws of nature and could be derived from them as their permanent conditions, and in connection with them form the links of one and the same series in the order of nature. Secondly, we should have to allow to it an *intelligible character* also, by which, it is true, it becomes the cause of the same acts as phenomena, but which itself is not subject to any conditions of sensibility, and never phenomenal. We might call the former the character of such a thing as phenomenon, in the latter, the character of the thing by itself.”²

The idea which passages like this suggest is that the objects which form parts of the experienced world are, considered in themselves, or viewed as it were from within, akin to self. What appears to us as objects held together in one space and mutually influencing each other, thereby undergoing changes linked together according to the law of causality, are, as noumena, active selves. These active selves or efficient causes, again, are comprised within and form organic elements of the absolutely necessary Being which is the ground of the *mundus sensibilis*. It is essential to remember that in Kant's view there is not *one* intelligible cause but a plurality of intelligible causes, though, ultimately, they are all constituent elements of the one supreme Being. The unity of the absolutely necessary Being must not

² *Op. cit.*, p. 436.

be confused with the efficient causes which are a plurality. If we carefully consider Kant's statements in regard to the relation between the intelligible world and the sensible world, we find that he affirms three things explicitly or implicitly. In the first place, he maintains that sensible objects are phenomenal expressions of active spiritual essences. These essences, therefore, must be as many as there are distinguishable things. "For every series of conditions, there must be an unconditioned." Successive changes are determinations of a single substance and if each series of changes is the outer expression of what in its intelligible character is an active spiritual being, it follows that a plurality of substances, conceived as things by themselves, are a plurality of active selves. "In every subject of the world of sense," Kant tells us, "we should have first an empirical character and secondly, an intelligible character." If so, it cannot but be that behind the plurality of phenomenal substances there are a plurality of noumenal beings or spirits.

In the second place, it is Kant's view that the intelligible causes of phenomena are not distinct and isolated from each other but integral parts of the one ultimate unconditioned Being. If there is a nexus between phenomenal substances, if they are real only as they mutually determine each other, there must necessarily be an ideal nexus between the noumenal realities of which they are expressions. In fact, Kant's thought in this matter is not much different from what Lotze, drawing his inspiration mainly from Leibniz, worked out afterwards. His supreme Being is very like Lotze's, and includes within itself as elements of its being all the intelligible causes which are behind phenomena.

In the third place, the way in which Kant solves the third and fourth antinomies necessarily leads to the view that the phenomenal world is the expression of the intelligible world and is, therefore, involved in its being. Kant does not develop a consistent theory of the relation between the *mundus intelligibilis* and *mundus sensibilis*. According to the Analytic, the phenomenal world is constituted by the understanding and is, therefore, only an appearance *to us* of the real world lying behind

it, but the view which the Dialectic suggests is that phenomena are the *empirical* character of the *noumena* revealed in them and are, therefore, not phenomena merely in relation to us but also in relation to the noumena themselves.

Kant's conception of the supreme Being carries his thought a stage further and reveals his meaning more fully. He regards it as the ideal principle from which nothing positive is excluded and of which everything is an expression. "If our reason," he argues, "postulates a transcendental substratum for all determinations, a substratum which contains, as it were, the whole store of material whence all possible predicates of things may be taken, we shall find that such a substratum is nothing but the idea of the sum total of reality. In that case all true negations are nothing but *limitations*, which they could not be unless there were the substratum of the unlimited."¹ The *ens realissimum* is the perfect whole from which particular realities are derived by limitation. "All the manifoldness of things consists only of so many modes of limiting the concept of the highest reality that forms their common substratum, in the same way as all figures are only different modes of limiting endless space." The most perfect Being is the ultimate unity which expresses itself in and contains within itself all particular things which, in their true nature, are akin to self. Kant's use of the disjunctive syllogism as the symbol of the *ens realissimum* throws light on his meaning. The disjunctive syllogism represents the idea of the complete determination of a whole through its exhaustive expression in its mutually exclusive members, each of which is limited and defined by its relations to the rest, and if it typifies the most perfect Being, it is because the most perfect Being is the ideal unity on which all things are grounded and from which they proceed. "The transcendental major of the complete determination of all things," observes Kant, "is nothing but a representation of the sum total of all reality and not only a concept which comprehends all predicates, according to their transcendental content *under* itself, but *within* itself; and the complete determination of every thing depends on the limitation of the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 465.

total of this reality, of which some part is ascribed to the thing, while the rest is excluded from it, a procedure which agrees with the *aut—aut* of a disjunctive major and with the determination of the object through one of the members of that division in the minor. Thus the procedure of reason by which the transcendental ideal becomes the basis of the determination of all possible things is analogous to that which reason follows in disjunctive syllogism.”¹

We have distinguished six main stages in the development of Kant's concept of the 'thing-in-itself.' First, it comes before us as the unknown cause of our sensuous affections. Then it is the unnavigated ocean that bounds the island of the world of experience. Next, it is the regulative idea which imparts unity to our experience. Next, it is the analogue of the unity of self-consciousness. Next, it is the unconditioned background of sensible phenomena and the sum total of the intelligible causes to which series of changes are referred. And, finally, it is the *ens realissimum*, the perceptive understanding “that thinks in intuitive ideas in some such way as the creative genius thinks in images.” The 'thing-in-itself,' in its ultimate development, is no other than God who, in the words of Paulsen, “is the primeval cause of the possibility of all being, out of which that of every entity must be regarded as derived by limitation; so that there is no entity which would not be posited in God's being.”²

It is true that Kant, who thus conducts us step by step into the intelligible world, frequently turns round and reminds us that it is only dreamland and must not be mistaken for *terra firma*. This, however, need not unduly discourage us. Kant's agnosticism, after all, is a very thin veil which but imperfectly conceals the deep-rooted convictions of his mind. As Paulsen rightly observes, he “has a really transcendent metaphysic. He gives his complete adherence to it as the rational view of the world. But it is not possible as a *priori* demonstrable knowledge of the understanding, as scholastic philosophy tried to be. From

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 466.

² *Immanuel Kant: His Life and Doctrine*, English tr., p. 221.

such a standpoint only mathematical physics is possible, which is concerned solely with phenomena and their necessary relations in space and time. Reason, on the other hand, necessarily passes beyond the phenomenal world to the intelligible world, which is a world of existing ideas that are conjoined by logical and teleological relations and are intuitively present in the divine intellect. . . . It is clear that this is the Platonic-Leibnizian philosophy. Kant had it constantly before his eyes in Baumgarten's Text Book. Reality, as the understanding thinks, in contradistinction to sensibility, is a system of monads which are joined in a unity by means of preëstablished harmony or an *influxus idealis*, like that which exists between the parts of a construction of thought or a poem. The ultimate ground of the unity of things is their radical unity in God's being, while bodies, on the contrary, are merely *phenomena substantiata*. Kant never discarded any of these ideas." ¹

Now the conception of the ultimate reality as a system of minds in which an all-inclusive spiritual principle is realized is also the central idea of Hegel's philosophy. Interpreters of Hegel have so insisted upon his monism that they have almost overlooked the pluralism which is as much a distinguishing feature of his philosophy as its monism. He has been accused of an uncompromising pantheism, his universe has been characterized as the 'block universe' and, in entire oblivion of what is urged in the introduction to the *Phenomenology of Mind* and elsewhere, he has been supposed to deduce the concrete world of differences from a unity as abstract as the Being of Parmenides. But at least one profound student of Hegel, Dr. McTaggart, has tried to show that Hegel's Absolute is not a unity in which all differences disappear, but an impersonal unity of finite but perfect selves.² That such an interpretation is possible only proves that pluralism is a very noticeable feature of Hegel's doctrine. The truth is that Hegel is much nearer to Leibniz in his outlook on the universe than is commonly supposed. Like Leibniz he conceives of the world as an organic unity of

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 276.

² See chapters on "Human Immortality" and "The Personality of the Absolute" in *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*.

spiritual beings, each of which ideates the whole universe from its own unique point of view. The main difference, and it is a very important difference, is that while Leibniz is not quite clear as to the nature of the monad of monads, sometimes conceiving of it as external to the monads that compose the world, sometimes reducing it almost to the preëstablished harmony, and sometimes viewing it as immanent in the world-system in spite of its independence of that system, Hegel regards the Absolute not indeed, as Dr. McTaggart thinks, as an impersonal unity of persons, but as the universal self which is particularized and completely present in every one of its constituent selves. The universal self has no content other than the individual selves. It is the organic unity of them and has no existence apart from them. Its relation to its component selves is analogous to the relation of the unity of our own self to its determinations. The human self is not a mere aggregate of its states, nor, on the other hand, is it something by itself, apart from its passing modifications. Its unity is expressed completely and indivisibly in each of its determinations, and, though it has no content other than them, it is not a sum of them but their ideal unity in which their differences are at once preserved and annulled. The Absolute of Hegel is subject-object. It is the all-inclusive unity which is bifurcated into the subject, which is such only as it goes out of itself to the object (the good), and the object, which is real only as it centres itself in the subject (the true). The necessary counterpart of the subject is the object. But the object is not a bare unity: it is a complex system of interrelated things. Now it seems to me that where most of the commentators of Hegel have gone wrong is in conceiving of the Absolute as subject, which is the correlative of the Absolute as object, as a monadic unity. But how can the counterpart of a *system* of things be an undifferentiated unity? It is no answer to say that the subject is differentiated into objects. In being thus differentiated the subject is not separated from its objects, but goes forth to them and, undiminished and undivided, is present to each one of them as its sustaining principle. To see this is to perceive that

the universal self is no mere unity but a totality of the selves of these objects. In other words, within the all-inclusive unity of the Absolute, the correlated elements, the subject and the object, are not, the former one, and the latter many, but each of them is at once one and many. Every object has behind it the universal self and is, therefore, ideal-real which as real excludes all other reals held together in one world, and as ideal embraces within its consciousness and from its special point of view as the self of a definite object the whole of that world. And as all objects are comprised within the unity of the world, so the interpenetrating selves of these objects are unified in the Absolute self.

I have elsewhere¹ tried to set forth the reasons which lead to the conclusion that this is the real view of Hegel, the Leibnizian cast of which is evident. It is the view which is distinctly suggested by Plato's conception of the Good, and the indebtedness of Hegel to Greek philosophy and particularly to Plato and Aristotle must never be forgotten. The very divisions of his system—Logic, the Philosophy of Nature, and the Philosophy of Mind correspond to Plato's classification of philosophical topics into Dialectic, Physics, and Ethics; the name given to the method employed and its spirit is the same, and one would not be far from the truth in maintaining that the idealism of Plato supplemented by Aristotle's conception of the material world as evolving from potentiality to actuality, as seeking to realize explicitly the form which is immanent in it and is its moving principle, furnishes much of the material of Hegel's philosophy.² It really arose from the study of Kant with the eyes of Plato and Aristotle, and of Plato and Aristotle with the eyes of Kant. The likeness between Hegel's Absolute Idea and Plato's Idea of Good, somewhat remote though it may be, is unmistakable. Just as the Idea of Good is not a unity reached by abstraction but by synthesis, a unity which organically connects all other Ideas with each other and with itself and gives to each its proper place

¹ In my *Hegelianism and Human Personality* published by the University of Calcutta.

² The Platonic influence on both of them, no doubt, largely accounts for the similarity between the views of Leibniz and Hegel.

in the total system, the Ideas being not mere things nor mere concepts of the mind but thinking beings, so the Absolute Idea, if we rightly view it, is the subject-object which, as subject, is a community of selves and, as object, a system of interrelated things.

Hegel's view of the relation between the finite and the infinite expresses his meaning. The infinite is not an endless series of finites, nor is it something beyond the finite. On both of these notions he pours contempt and points out that an infinite which is other than the finite stands limited by it and is, therefore, only another finite. The genuine infinite is *in* the finite and is its ideality. This means that everything which we call finite has a double aspect: as a particular object limited by other objects from which it is distinguished, it is real; but as that which returns upon itself from the process of going beyond itself that makes it finite, it is ideal. This ideality of the thing makes it an independent being—a being-for-self. The whole tone of Hegel's discussion of the categories of ideality, the infinite and being-for-self shows that he does not mean by these terms a merely general principle of the unity of all things, but a principle which is general by being in the first instance the ideality of each particular object. At this stage he emphasizes the plurality rather than the unity of things: the category of being-for-self leads directly to that of the one and many. Hegel's ideal-real is very similar to the monad of Leibniz which has the whole universe as its object of thought, though, as an individual, it has its special position in the world and excludes and is excluded by other beings like it. "Ideality only has a meaning or import when it is the ideality of some thing: but this something is not a mere indefinite this or that, but determinate being (there and then) which is characterised as reality, and which, if retained in isolation, possesses no truth."¹ What is clearly meant is that every finite object is *also* ideal; reality and ideality are two aspects of one and the same thing.

But the ideality of a thing makes it go beyond itself and bring the whole universe within the sweep of its comprehension. In

¹ Wallace's *The Logic of Hegel*, 1st ed., p. 154.

other words, the ideal principle is at once individualizing and universalizing. If it makes the individual what it is, it also brings it into connection with other individuals and reduces them to a system, in the whole and in each element of which it is concretely embodied. This is the aspect of the truth brought out in Hegel's doctrine of the notion. The notion is a concrete universal which particularizes itself in each individual; and because it is a universal, it cannot be confined to any particular individual but passes beyond it to other individuals and thus becomes the immanent bond of union between them. The individual in which the notion is expressed is not, it is needless to say, a part of the notion; it is the *whole* notion in a particular form. The individuals, therefore, are also the universal, and the universal is also the organic unity of the individuals. The universal, that is to say, is a "macrocosm made up of microcosms which is all in every part." The notion as a spiritual principle of unity of all things, as that which connects all things with and yet separates them from each other by its presence to each one of them whole and undivided, must be conceived as mind. "It is one of the deepest and truest instances of insight to be found in the *Critique of Reason*," Hegel tells us, "that the unity which constitutes the essence of the concept is recognised as the original synthetic unity of apperception, as the unity of the 'I think' or of self-consciousness." Now if the notion's own specification "can only be an existence in which it appears as identical with itself and whose factors are notions posited by itself," and if the notion is self, then it follows that the ultimate reality must be viewed as a self of selves, a universal self that finds expression in its constituent individuals which also are selves.¹

It appears then that Hegel does not conceive of the world as centred in a single undifferentiated self. Each object, in so far as it is ideal, is the centre of the world-system; but as the objects mutually imply each other and therefore constitute *one* world, their selves also come together and constitute the one

¹ The Absolute Idea, which is the final category of Hegel, is what the notion is. It does not contain any new determination but unfolds explicitly all that is implied in the notion.

universal self. Or, to look at the same truth from the other side, the universal self manifests itself in a plurality of objects and is, therefore, differentiated not merely into these objects but also into their selves. The Absolute self, in short, is, if one, also many: it is a one-in-many. It cognizes the universe from all possible points of view and its knowledge of it from the standpoint of a particular object is the ideality of that object.

In the philosophy of Lotze, we find the principles of Leibniz developed along monistic lines. Lotze avowedly builds on the foundations of Leibniz, but he restores to the world the unity which, in his view, Leibniz destroys. This charge, however, is not entirely true. Leibniz, no doubt, begins by emphasizing the separateness of the monads, but, in the end, he is compelled to conceive of them as proceeding from and depending on God and as organized by Him into the unity of a coherent world. Lotze makes this deeper thought of Leibniz prominent. He shows that so far from being independent of each other, things are real only as they are related to each other. To be is to stand in relations. But the relatedness of things cannot be made intelligible unless we regard them as modes of the one all-embracing Absolute. And as the Absolute is mind, its modes which appear to us as sensible objects must also be conceived as minds. Lotze is fond of emphasizing his difference from Hegel, but no careful student can fail to perceive the similarity of the reasoning by which he is led to his conception of the Absolute, to that of Hegel. His discussion of substance, causality and the interaction of things, corresponds closely to Hegel's treatment of the categories of substance, causality and reciprocity. And the argument that things can determine each other because they are expressions of an underlying unity is only another form of the reasoning which leads Hegel from reciprocity to the notion. If due stress is laid on the pluralistic element of Hegel, his kinship with Lotze and of both with Leibniz cannot fail to be apparent.

The fundamental idea which Leibniz was the first to introduce into modern philosophy and which in one form or another has been retained by Kant, Hegel and Lotze is that the world, in

its last interpretation, is spirit whose nature it is to be one in many. Leibniz was never able to reconcile unity and plurality in a consistent manner, but he distinctly accords recognition to both of these aspects of reality. The unity of the world is due to its being the embodiment of the purpose of God, but of the relation of God to the world, Leibniz's conception, as I have already remarked, is somewhat nebulous. Kant, like Leibniz, conceives of the 'things-in-themselves' as minds grounded on God and, therefore, inherently connected with each other. Very similar is the idea of Lotze. Both agree in thinking that God transcends and is also immanent in the world, but neither seems to comprehend the significance of the great thought of Leibniz that every monad is a complete reality and is cognizant of the whole universe, at least potentially. Hegel, on the other hand, adopts this view and regards every object, in so far as it is ideal or being-for-self, as the notion itself in a determinate form and, therefore, like the notion all-inclusive. But he rejects the doctrine that God transcends the world. The Absolute experience contains nothing more than the experiences of the selves in which the Absolute is individualized and is the synthesis of them. It is the fusion of the different ways of representing the one world from the view-points of the individuals that compose it.

HIRALAL HALDAR.

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA.