

PHENOMENOLOGY OF SPIRIT AS
THE TELEOLOGICAL UNFOLDING OF CONSCIOUSNESS

FATMA DENİZ KANDEMİR

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2010

PHENOMENOLOGY OF SPIRIT AS
THE TELEOLOGICAL UNFOLDING OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Philosophy

by
Fatma Deniz Kandemir

Boğaziçi University

2010

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: ON HEGEL'S NOTION OF THE EXPERIENCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS	1
Preliminary Remarks: Philosophy in the Status of a Science	1
Natural Consciousness as the Object of Phenomenal Knowledge	7
Self-Consciousness as the Dialectical Movement of Consciousness to Be the Self	
CHAPTER II: ON HEGEL'S EVALUATION OF THE ARISTOTELIAN NOTION OF ESSENCE WITH RESPECT TO HIS OWN CONCEPTION OF CONSCIOUSNESS	62
The Aristotelian Conception of <i>Telos</i>	62
The Aristotelian Notion of Essence	67
CHAPTER III: ON BEHALF OF A CLOSURE DEDUCTION	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76

Thesis Abstract

Fatma Deniz Kandemir, “Phenomenology of Spirit as the Teleological Unfolding of Consciousness”

In this thesis, Hegel’s conception of the “experience of consciousness” as the very movement of natural consciousness towards knowledge of itself will be under scrutiny with the intention of being capable of justifying the following claim.

What is undertaken throughout the *PhS* majorly consists in demonstrating that natural consciousness is in essence already destined towards absolute knowledge, the concept of knowledge as its *telos*.

The entire work, *PhS*, seems to me to be described as the teleological unfolding of consciousness regarding the very fact that “The true is the whole” as “[n]othing other than the essence consummating itself through its own developmen[t]”. For the validation of such an argument, the parts of the *PhS* containing the detailed journey of consciousness from its natural state to the establishment of knowledge of its own will be under cover throughout this work. Besides, in an attempt to justify that this journey of consciousness is teleological in essence, the Aristotelian conception of essence in relation to the notion of *telos* will be in charge.

Tez Özeti

Fatma Deniz Kandemir, “Phenomenology of Spirit as the Teleological Unfolding of Consciousness”

Bu çalışmada, Hegel’in “bilincin deneyimi” kavramı üzerinden doğal bilincin kendi bilgisine nasıl ulaştığı incelenecektir. Hegel’in *Tinin Görüngübilimi* adlı eserindeki analizinin doğal bilincin özünde kesin bilgiye ulaşmayı telos’u olarak içerdiği savını kanıtladığı görüşü tez boyunca savunulmaya çalışılmaktadır.

Ayrıca, bu sebeple, “Bir bütün olarak doğrunun kendi gelişimi üzerinden kendi kendisini ortaya koymakta” olduğu gerçeği de göz önünde bulundurularak *Tinin Görüngübilimi* eserinin bilincin teleolojik olarak ortaya çıkışı şeklinde tanımlanabileceği kanıtlanmaya çalışılacaktır.

Tüm bu savlar, bilincin yolculuğunun özünde teleolojik olduğunu kanıtlama uğraşısı içerisinde, Aristo’nun öz kavramı ve telos kavramı ile ilintili bir şekilde ele alınacaktır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe special thanks to the following persons without whom this thesis could not be carried out or at least it would have been probably stuck at somewhere throughout the five year journey.

First and foremost, I would like to mention my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Stephen Voss. Whenever I felt myself lost or in despair, he made me to believe that this project could be done. He has never left me alone and never gave up on having faith in me. I do always felt his support and guidance.

I would also like to express my feelings of thankfulness to first Chryssi Sidiropoulou and then Türker Armaner. Ms. Sidiropoulou has given a lot of support to this work not only as a guiding competent professor but also as a kind hearted tender friend. I am also grateful to Mr. Armaner with all my heart for both his patience throughout the work and gentle kindness at the times whenever I failed to fulfill my promises.

Önay Sözer can be accounted as the genuine figure of inspiration behind this work. Without his precious comments on the *Phenomenology of Spirit* and his interpretation of the overall work, this project could not take its present shape.

My special thanks also goes to Ferda Keskin who did never returned my requests for his supervision and has always been there whenever I need help.

As a person who believes the Hegelian thesis that without history anyone cannot be, I would like to present my very special thanks to all 04 philosophy majors; especially to Oyman Başaran, Elif Şendur, Dilek Hüseyinzadegan, Onur Özdemir, Tuğçe Baykent, Burcu Ayöz, Pakize Arıkan, Işıl Uluç, Banu Yıllankaya and Deniz Durmuş. This had been started as a journey through which we were side by side. At a time where I feel that this journey has come to an end for me, I would like to mention my gratitude to each of these persons. In particular,

I need to mention that Deniz Durmuş has been an important figure for me both as a supportive caring friend and a brilliant colleague.

Last but not least, if this piece of writing is worthwhile to anything, then it must be dedicated to my dearest family without doubt. I would like you to know that I am fully indebted and grateful to them; my mother as delicate as the fall of spring rain, my father as strong as a hard stone, my sister as brilliant as a lonely star, my brother-in-law as caring as a genuine brother and my dearest nephew as the sweetest sunlight that I have ever felt throughout my entire life.

CHAPTER I:

ON HEGEL'S NOTION OF THE EXPERIENCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Preliminary Remarks: Philosophy in the Status of a Science

In the fifth paragraph of the 'Preface' of the *Phenomenology of Spirit (PhS)*, Hegel states that "[n]ow is the time for philosophy to be raised to the status of a Scienc[e]".¹ Along this line, it can be acknowledged that to help bring philosophy closer to the form of Science is what has been set as a goal by Hegel throughout the *PhS*.² In an attempt to answer the question why Hegel has found the previous philosophical systems as non-scientific, the specific sense of the conception of Science as is used in *PhS* should be investigated carefully.

To start with, the Hegelian conception of Science is exclusively preoccupied with the notion of "consciousness" that signifies the cognitive relation of a self to objecthood. Before going any further, it needs to be declared that although a thorough elucidation concerning the Hegelian understanding of the term "consciousness" will take place in the following parts of this thesis, an introductory historical assessment of this notion is required in order to facilitate the clarification of the relationship between Science and consciousness in the *PhS*.

When we take a look at the history of modern thought, it is not erroneous to articulate that "consciousness" first came to be spoken of by Descartes.³ The ego as a *res cogitans*, and the modes of operation of this *res as cogitationes*, have constituted the cornerstone of the Cartesian principle of self-consciousness.⁴ The peculiarity of this principle of self-

¹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977, p. 3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³ Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the History of Philosophy vol. 2*, trans. E. S. Haldane, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995, p. 57.

⁴ Descartes puts forward for the first time the concept of a *res cogitans* as the mental substance in the *Meditations*. In accordance with the Cartesian principle of self-consciousness by means of which the ego as the I has been described in the way of the indubitable starting point for perception, the *res cogitans* appears as "the thinking thing" having doubted everything including his/her own existence. (Please see in; Descartes, R., *Discourse on Method and the Meditations*, trans. F.E. Sutcliff, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968, p. 113.)

consciousness lies in the movement amidst the Cartesian subjects. In relating itself to itself through the perception of the other or object, ego cogitans, (the subject), starts to refer to itself while at the same time referring to its other, the perceived object. Thus, on the basis of this double relation, the subject becomes certain both of itself and of the known object.^{5-6-*}

From the point of view of Kant, another prominent precursor having a significant effect upon the Hegelian conceptualization of “consciousness”, it can be maintained that the movement between the subject and the object occurs in the following way.⁷ The pure self continually returns from its relation to the sphere of objecthood back to itself.⁸ Thus, this principle of movement embedded within Kantian transcendental philosophy took shape as a spontaneous logical act.⁹ In this regard, it can be further added that the pure Kantian self as the I engenders itself and generates its other, nature, the sphere of objecthood.¹⁰ To state in a different manner, the logical form of the pure self gives shape to the formless nature and organizes it by the use of its cognitive processes, Kant’s term, categorical synthesis.¹¹ Because of the fact that the movement of the pure self constantly returns from its relation to

⁵ Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* vol. 2, p. 57.

⁶ Descartes, R., *Discourse on Method and the Meditations*, p. 113.

* Please bear in mind as an important comment, concerning the above discussion upon the Cartesian principle of consciousness as well as the exploration of the principles of the Kantian transcendental philosophy, that an endeavor to give an account of historical background for the conception of consciousness is accomplished although it may seem to be superficial.

⁷ Taylor, C., *Hegel*, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 317.

⁸ Kant, I., *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. P. Guyer and A. Wood, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p.60.

⁹ The idea of transcendental philosophy gets its birth from a new science called “transcendental” by Kant. Initially, it does not deal directly with objects of empirical cognition but rather this new science gets in charge with an investigation as regards the conditions of the possibility of our experience of these objects. To put in another way, transcendental philosophy examines the required mental capacities for us to have any cognition of objects at all. (Please see in; Kant, I., *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 6.)

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 6.

¹¹ For Kant, the categorical synthesis can be viewed as the apprehension of the I aimed directly to the intuition. So as to put in an order diverse kinds of representations, the pure I acts in accordance with a constant rule determined categorically and views a manifold as contained in one representation. (Please see in; Kant, I., *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 229.)

the sphere of objecthood back to itself, it can be uttered that the philosophical tendency hidden beneath the surface of the Kantian transcendental pattern of movement deems itself as a “philosophy of reflection”.¹² Although further exploration on the disposition of this philosophy of reflection will be needed, we will concern ourselves for the time being only with the elucidation of the succeeding argument as regards philosophy of reflection. The conception of “consciousness”, for Hegel, signifies at once and without further commotion “the relation of the self-certain ego to an objecthood known as certain”.¹³

Up till now, an introduction of two historically essential figures of reflective philosophy has been attempted to be fairly accomplished for the purpose of comprehending the background of Hegel’s discernment on the conception of “consciousness”. Henceforward, we can now turn back to our endeavor to answer the question of why, for Hegel, the previous approaches of reflection philosophy are unable to succeed in bringing philosophical knowledge to the status of Science. Thus, the following citation can be asserted. In the Preface of the *PhS*, Hegel articulates that: “ours is a birth time and a period of transition to a new era. Spirit has broken with the world it has hitherto inhabited and imagined...so likewise the Spirit in its formation matures slowly and quietly into its new shape”.¹⁴

At the outset of the new epoch, the “beginning of the new spirit,” Hegel views his own approach, in contradistinction to that of his forerunners, as in the way that rational form of reflection can be reckoned in terms of an identity of the subjectivity and objectivity of the self.¹⁵ Moreover, according to Hegel, examples of such dichotomizing contrasts of the understanding as “spirit and matter” or “soul and body” present us the fact that rigid precise

¹² Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 26.

¹³ Werner, M., *Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit: A Commentary Based on the Preface and Introduction*, trans. P. Heath, Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press: 1975, p. 3.

¹⁴ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 6.

¹⁵ Ibid.

oppositions are reinforced by the standpoints of the preceding reflection philosophies.¹⁶ The occurrence of an opposition, for Hegel, is mostly due to an approach assigning power to self-consciousness in order to make a division in between the object and subject of cognition.¹⁷ Only can the movement of such a reversion to identity, surmounting the aforementioned possibility of opposition, succeed in constituting an exercise of reason.¹⁸ Let us further examine the aforementioned argument and its premises thoroughly below.

As is indicated by Hegel at the beginning of the Introduction of the *PhS*, the former philosophical approaches prevailing before the arrival of the new epoch come to a sort of understanding about cognition in such a way that it “is regarded either as the instrument to get hold of the Absolute or as the medium through which one discovers it”.¹⁹ Please note as a prominent remark that the Hegelian understanding of the concept of cognition here in question is taken as a faculty of knowing before any supplementary discussion has been carried out on the issue.²⁰ To proceed, it is necessary for us to explicate Hegel’s critical assessment of the views evaluating cognition either as an instrument or as a medium. First of all, if we think of cognition as “[t]he instrument for getting hold of absolute being, it is obvious that the use of an instrument on a thing certainly does not let it be what it is for itself, but rather sets out to reshape and alter it”.²¹ On the other hand, if cognition is deemed as a medium rather than an instrument, then we can say that truth reaches us by means of this medium.²² However, as a necessary consequence of such an occasion, we do not receive the

¹⁶ Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* vol. 2, p. 57.

¹⁷ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 6.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 46.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 21.

²¹ Ibid., p. 46.

²² Ibid., p. 47.

truth as it is in itself but only as it exists through and in this medium. To conclude, it can be stated according to Hegel that “either way we employ a means which immediately brings about the opposite of its own end; or rather, what is really absurd is that we should make use of a means at all”.²³

In contrast to an understanding of cognition separating the object of knowing from the subject of knowing via viewing cognition either as an instrument or as a medium, Hegel, while constituting his own philosophy of reflection, attempted to arrive at a conception of reflection which could serve as an “instrument of philosophizing”.²⁴ In other words, for Hegel, the task of philosophy or the answer to the need of philosophy should not be limiting or determining but rather enabling cognition to ascend beyond itself to a rational form of reflection.²⁵ Reflection as:

Pure self-recognition in absolute otherness, this Aether as *such*, is the ground and soil of Science or *knowledge in general*. The beginning of philosophy presupposes or requires that consciousness should dwell in this *element*...Because this element, this immediacy of Spirit, is the very substance of Spirit...*being* that is reflected into itself.²⁶

Following the above mentioned quotation from the *PhS*, it can be further avowed that Hegel does not put the examination of the reality of cognition aside by making a conclusion that consciousness is both consciousness of object and consciousness of itself.²⁷ In preference to the reflection merely exercised in the form of understanding as “thinking common to the scientific and unscientific mind alike but enabling the unscientific mind to enter the domain of

²³ Ibid., p. 46.

²⁴ Hegel, G. W. F., *The Difference between Fichte's and Schelling's System of Philosophy*, trans. H. S. Harris and W. Cerf, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977, p. 178.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 172, p. 177.

²⁶ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 6.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 54.

science”, Hegel further ensues by averring that “the goal to be reached is the mind’s insight into what knowing is”.²⁸⁻²⁹

Henceforth, for Hegel, it is significant to bear in mind that “[t]o help bring philosophy closer to the form of Scienc[e]” is “[t]he goal where it can lay aside the title ‘love of knowing’ and be actual knowin[g]”.³⁰ Depending upon the fact that reflection is taken in such a way that it is the ground of Science required for the establishment of knowledge in general as is aforementioned at the latest citation from the *PhS*, it can be claimed that natural consciousness traverses the series of its shapes. Thus, the detailed history of the training of consciousness itself can be raised up to the level of science.³¹ The natural consciousness ought to take the path to this determined goal and ought to take it now, and it thus, qua the peculiarity of phenomenal knowing as a cognitive mode of the natural consciousness, ought to become the object of knowledge.³²

In this thesis, Hegel’s conception of the “experience of consciousness” as the very movement of natural consciousness towards knowledge of itself will be under scrutiny with the intention of being capable of justifying the following claim. What is undertaken throughout the *PhS* mainly consists in demonstrating that natural consciousness is in essence already destined towards absolute knowledge, the concept of knowledge as its *telos*. The entire work, *PhS*, seems to me to be described as the teleological unfolding of consciousness regarding the very fact that “The true is the whole” as “nothing other than the essence consummating itself through its own development”.³³ For the validation of such an argument,

²⁸ Ibid., p. 77.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 90.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 3.

³¹ Ibid., p. 136.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., p. 11.

the parts of the *PhS* containing the detailed journey of consciousness from its natural state to the establishment of knowledge of its own will be under cover throughout this work. Besides, in an attempt to justify that this journey of consciousness is teleological in essence, the Aristotelian conception of essence in relation to the notion of *telos* will be operative.

Natural Consciousness as the Object of Phenomenal Knowledge

The Conception of Natural Consciousness in General Terms

Since Hegel himself demarcates the *PhS* as “an exposition of how knowledge makes its appearance” in the way of “natural consciousness which presses forward to true knowledge”, it can be further argued that Hegel initiates such an elucidation for knowledge with what is at hand.³⁴⁻³⁵ In other words, natural or common consciousness is the primary target of this exposition. To put the matter of discussion in much more plain words by means of an analogy, let us quote from the 8th paragraph of the *PhS*:

Instead of dwelling in this world’s presence, men looked beyond it, following this thread to an other-worldly presence, so to speak. The eye of the Spirit had to be forcibly turned and held fast to the things of this world; and it has taken a long time before the lucidity which only heavenly things used to have could penetrate the dullness and confusion in which the sense of worldly things was enveloped, and so make attention to the here and now as such, attention to what has been called ‘experience’, an interesting and valid enterprise.³⁶

In accordance with the above asserted quotation, it is not wrong to avow that *the totality of the things of this world* inaugurates what determines and limits consciousness. In this sense, the meaning of the qualification natural as applied to the consciousness does not mean either “bodily existence” or “organic nature”. Rather, the term nature seems to me to denote nothing but simply “[t]he given circumstances, situation, habits, customs, religion and so fort[h]” as regards the Hegelian context.³⁷

³⁴ Ibid., p. 49.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 5.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 333.

To proceed with the representation of natural consciousness made so far, the following statement can be uttered. The natural consciousness exists essentially in immediate unity with all the circumstances in the total situation which at any given time dominates and determines it.³⁸ In an attempt to study a bit more on the above-mentioned claim, it can be further added that natural consciousness has the knowledge of what is immediate insofar as the entirety of the given circumstances designates the conditions necessary for the “reflective movement of consciousness”. Indeed, Hegel, through the examination of the entire phenomenological development, attempts to show how consciousness begins with an equality that will later be its end. In other words, for Hegel, consciousness strives to attain the goal of the knowledge of the reality that it will afterwards reconquer reflectively. As an essential remark to have in mind at that point of the discussion, the equality here in question should be understood as the relationship between the subjective certainty of consciousness on its knowledge of the immediate and the objective truth of the immediate thing.

If we return to the beginning of our discussion with regard to what has been discussed up to now, then the relationship amidst the immediate unity of consciousness and its determining situation is also referred to in the *PhS* under the conception of the “shape of consciousness”.³⁹ Natural consciousness appears in a multitude of shapes and it surmounts the previous shape whenever it removes into a new one. This is the reason why the naturalness of consciousness is not natural in the sense of an eternal nature, but is rather, on the contrary, a changing and in this sense a historical consciousness. This historical character of the protean natural consciousness is further attested by the fact that all former shapes laid aside at present belong to the inorganic nature of any given consciousness. From the words of Hegel:

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 17.

Experience is the name we give to just this movement, in which the immediate, the unexperienced, i.e. the abstract, whether it be of sensuous [but still unsensed] being, or only thought of as simple, becomes alienated from itself and then returns to itself from this alienation and is only then revealed for the first time in its actuality and truth, just as it then has become a property of consciousness also.⁴⁰

However, in order to understand in its further details the experience of consciousness as the movement of unfolding of consciousness through passing from one shape to another as well as preserving the content of the former in the latter, we need to start with what is in our hands as is done by Hegel. For that reason, the notion of immediate knowledge will be under an entrenched appraisal in the next section.

Immediate Knowledge of Natural Consciousness:
Phenomenal Knowledge Going Through the Phases of
Sensuous Certainty-Perception and the Force of Understanding

Sensuous Certainty

As is already mentioned, there appears a distinction at the beginning pages of the *PhS* concerning the moment of consciousness. To reiterate once more the basic premise of such kind of a distinction, it can be noted that the moment of consciousness in its simplest form appears as the moment of separation between subject and object, between certainty and truth.⁴¹ Both of the two parities mentioned in this separation are posed within an equal relationship.

To state in a different manner, consciousness and its object appears to be surrounded as close as possible by an immediate relation to unity in between certainty and truth. Hegel's terms: "[t]he immediate relation in fact means only unit[y]".⁴² For that reason, Hegel states in the *PhS* that consciousness knows its object immediately.⁴³ By virtue of being immediate, this immediate knowledge of consciousness can be defined as the knowledge of the immediate.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 21.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 6.

⁴² Ibid., p. 55.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 61.

This knowledge is immediate to the extent that certainty is taken to be equal to truth immediately. To quote from Hegel's own words: "The knowledge that is our object at the beginning, or immediately, can only be the knowledge that is itself immediate knowledge, that is, knowledge of the immediate, knowledge of the existing".⁴⁴ For a fuller explanation of the detailed aspects of immediate knowledge, the internal dialectics of sensuous certainty should be much more appreciated below.

Immediate knowledge seems to appear at first sight as the richest since it has no limits in time and space. Besides, it unfolds itself in them indefinitely.⁴⁵ Following Jean Hyppolite, it could even be claimed that "it is as if space and time were the very symbol of that inexhaustible richness".⁴⁶ Moreover, it may come into view that the immediate knowledge of the sensuous certainty is the truest, the most precise and the most determinate due to the fact that it has not yet separated anything from the object but has it before it in all its fullness.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, since sensuous certainty rejects any mediation or any abstraction that might alter its object, it knows its object of knowledge as its other. Sensuous certainty, for Hegel, cannot develop as consciousness which either represents to itself objects diversely or compares them among themselves. Thus, it cannot introduce reflection and substitute mediated form of knowledge instead of its own place. To explicate the issue much more thoroughly by means of an example, let us take a look at the following instance.

When one states that "*here* it is *cold* today" or "the dress that she is wearing *now* is *red*", the words *cold* and *red* designate qualities and presuppose comparisons. They stand not only for what one experiences but also for the other cold days and red dresses. Thus, it can be

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 66.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Hyppolite, J., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. S. Cherniak and J. Heckman, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974, p. 84.

⁴⁷ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 71.

additionally upheld that these words introduce mediation into knowledge. Such a placement of these words, for Hegel, actually presents the route for abstraction and negation insofar as to assert “something is *here* or *now*” is in fact to say any moment in time or any point in space.⁴⁸ However, the situation of natural consciousness which knows its object immediately can be compared to a one-year old speechless child to the degree that it cannot name its object of knowledge without the introduction of a kind of mediation. From Hegel’s own words: “In point of fact, nevertheless, this certainty explicitly acknowledges that it is the most abstract truth and the poorest. It only says ‘it is’ about what it knows and its truth contains only the being of the thing”.⁴⁹ The sensuous certainty provided by the immediate knowledge is ineffable. For that reason, it is impotent.⁵⁰ In compliance with what Hegel has stated in the *PhS*, it can be avowed that to be effable is necessary for an experience to have a truth value.

To answer the question of what subsists in sensuous certainty seems to me to be crucial in order to explicate the transition of consciousness to the phase of perception. Indeed, we know that sensuous consciousness can only say “what this is” and thus can pose independently of all mediation the absolute nature of an existent. To proceed in line with Hegel’s own comments: “This being is the necessary being, and the necessity is but the immediate reflection of this being back on itself. It is because it is”.⁵¹ At first, the object of sensuous certainty, far from being immediate existence, emerges as an abstraction to the degree that the universal as the negation of every particular *this* has been manifested for the first time in natural consciousness.⁵² At that point of the discussion, it is worthwhile to shed

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 79.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 75.

⁵² Ibid., p. 64.

some further light upon Hegel's understanding of mediation. With such an intention, the 21st paragraph of the *PhS* can be introduced where Hegel mentions that:

For mediation is nothing beyond self-moving selfsameness, or is reflection into self, the moment of the 'I' which is for itself pure negativity or, when reduced to its pure abstraction, simple becoming. The 'I' or becoming in general, this mediation, on account of its simple nature, is just immediacy in the process of becoming, and is the immediate itself.⁵³

From my own point of view, à propos of Hegel's excerpt above on the notion of mediation, it can be put into words that a unique *now* has already ceased to be as a specific quality when it is shown to the 'I'.⁵⁴ Such kind of a movement emerges as an act of mediation.⁵⁵

In consequence, it can be concluded that what remains is a certain unity in the multiple. What is more is the following. A particular sensuous certainty turns out to be the experience of this mediation that constitutes what it claims to be immediate. Our new object of experience, perception, is revealed to us in "the thing endowed with multiple properties" through an experience of a certain interpenetration of the universal and the specific or a certain unity of the diverse and the unity.⁵⁶ In the movement of presentation, sensuous consciousness emerges from itself. Its knowledge become other for it. It genuinely perceives and the object of perception is a thing with multiple properties.⁵⁷ To cite from the *PhS*: "The richness of sensuous knowledge pertains to perception and to immediate certainty, in which that richness was only what was bypassed; for only perception includes negation, difference or diverse multiplicity in its essence".⁵⁸ In other words, to bring the discussion on sensuous

⁵³ Ibid., p. 11.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 73.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 60.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 75.

certainty to an end before introducing perception in its very details, mediation and negation are external to both being and knowledge in the case of sensuous certainty.

Perception

Regarding perception, it can be enunciated that to perceive is no longer to remain content with the ineffable of sensuous certainty. Rather, it is to move beyond sensuous certainty and to reach the universal. Hegel defines universal as “[a] simple entity of this kind, which is through the mediation of negation, which is neither this nor that but can be equally this or that, a universal”.⁵⁹ This universal, which we have seen that it arises in the course of the dialectic of sensuous certainty and which is henceforth the new object of phenomenal consciousness, is the principle of perception.⁶⁰ However, the analysis of the question of in what sense the universal has appeared to us as the general principle of perception needs to be done within a deeper context.

Hegel, in the *PhS*, goes on with articulating that “the universal is nothing but thingness (Dingheit)” which purely represents a kind of setting ensemble of multiple terms.⁶¹ For instance, let us think of sand. It is a simple *here* and at the same time it involves diverse types of properties. It is brown-yellow, *also* cubical, *also* hard, *also* of a determinate length. All these properties coexist in it with ease. They neither penetrate nor affect each other but they participate in universality because they express thingness.⁶² Not only does perception transcend the sensuous certainty. But also it “preserves immediateness and is itself sensuous, but it is a universal immediateness”.⁶³ Thus, it can be maintained that every sensuous determination becomes universal whenever it is captured in thingness by being able to add up

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 101.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 97.

⁶² Ibid., p. 98.

⁶³ Ibid.

the sensible properties of the immediate object of knowledge. The specific color and the hardness of the sand in my hands do resemble the color and the hardness of another mineral. These specificities extend beyond this sand as the object of contemplation.

Nonetheless, thingness or the universal can also be taken as the expression of itself in the various determinations. These determinations are the attributes of the universal. Hence, the universal appears as a determination of thought. Furthermore, it can be enunciated that the substance, the “also” gathers up all the determinations of the universal.⁶⁴ The substance becomes the medium in which the attributes of the universal coexist. From Hegel’s own words: “This ‘also’ is hence the pure universal itself, or the medium; it is thingness gathering all these properties”.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, not only thingness as the simple medium of the properties but also a determinate thing-in-and-for-itself is claimed to be perceived by consciousness.⁶⁶ The determinate thing-in-and-for-itself here in question can be named as the crystal of sand. This determination of thought also signifies “pure uniqueness, exclusive entity” which is genuinely manifested neither by substance (the universal) in general nor by attributes (the particular) but rather by its specificity (the mode).⁶⁷ Thingness as determinate in-and-for-itself is a unique thing insofar as it is the *determinate negation*.⁶⁸ In other words, it is the negation which excludes from itself everything else. For instance, the specificity of the crystal of sand representing such properties as a unique color, hardness and extension excludes other objects having distinct properties. As regards the above considerations, it is not erroneous to pronounce that things are not only universal but also specific. Moreover, these

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 94.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 91.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 100.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

two characteristics constitute the thing as the object of the perceiving consciousness. To cite from the *PhS* on the relation of the thingness, universal and the determinate negation:

In the property, negation as determinateness is immediately, in turn, is universality through its unity with negation. But negation is like an entity when negation is freed from this unity with the contrary and exists in and for itself. Sensuous universality, or the immediate unity of being and the negative is thus a property of only when the entity and universality are developed from it and distinguished from each other, and when this sensuous universality combines them; only this relation of sensuous universality to the pure essential moments completes the thing.⁶⁹

When we look on the side of the perceiving consciousness, what has been mentioned so far about the constitution of the perceived thing can also be articulated for consciousness. An aggregate of faculties such as memory or imagination can be deemed as the constituents of the soul. Whilst perceiving consciousness is endeavoring to explain the coexistence of a range of qualities at one object, it is also in need of dealing with a fiction of the understanding offered as a physical reality.⁷⁰ This fiction is the occurrence of a vicious circle through which one kind of matter in the physical reality is explicated with the entrance of another kind of matter. In relation to the perceiving thing, the same way of appraisal on the “influence of memory on imagination and of imagination on memory, of their interpenetration” is conspicuous as in the case of the perceived object. According to both Jean Hyppolite and Theodor Adorno, this parallelism between the structures of the consciousness and its object become apparent throughout the *PhS* only if the fact that “consciousness changes whenever the object changes” is accepted.⁷¹⁻⁷² From the viewpoint of Hegel: “The first is the act of perceiving; the second is the object. In its essence, the object is the same thing as the movement. The movement is the

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 90.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 101.

⁷¹ Hyppolite, J., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 107.

⁷² Adorno, T., *Hegel: Three Studies*, trans. S. W. Nicholzen, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993, p. 142.

unfolding and the differentiation of the moments; the object is their assembling and unification”.⁷³

Thus, following the above quotation, it is not erroneous to articulate that the act of perceiving is this synthesis of a diversity affected by consciousness. The significance of such kind of a distinction turns out to be obvious as soon as we accept that perceiving consciousness attributes essence to the object and non-essence to itself. This is mostly due to the fact that “[i]t is itself the consciousness of this contradiction, consciousness places itself on the side of changing consciousness and appears to itself as the inessential”.⁷⁴ Given that the truth for consciousness is independent of the reflection retrieving the object, consciousness commences by ascribing the inessential reflection to itself whilst making the object in its self-identity the essence. Without regard to whether it is perceived or not, the object is determined as the simple.⁷⁵ On the contrary, perceiving movement is evaluated by Hegel as something inconstant. Following Hegel, “diversity is for the perceiving consciousness, the latter’s behavior is the act of relating the various moments of its apprehension to each other.”⁷⁶ Nevertheless, “if in this comparison an inequality is produced, that is an untruth not of the object, for the object is that which is equal to itself, but only of the perceiving activity”.⁷⁷ To bring to an end what has been discussed up to now, it can be maintained with reference to the perceiving consciousness that the object side is truth whereas the subject side is a mere reflection.

However, the discovery of contradictions in the pure determinateness of the thing may lead us to try to distinguish in-between what comes from the thing itself as the true and what

⁷³ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 74.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 134.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 83.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 90.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

comes from our reflection. In accordance with the distinctive manifestations of this reflection, the true can also vary. As one of the necessary consequences of such a variation in truth, the true itself comes into view as reflecting on itself both from inside and outside. From that moment on, the movement of the object and of perceiving consciousness relative to each other becomes the integral movement of the object.⁷⁸ Hence, consciousness has the chance of viewing itself in its object unintentionally.⁷⁹ Likewise, the object of perception comes out as the concept in-itself.⁸⁰ Hegel's terms: "For us, the development of this object by means of the movement of consciousness has become such that consciousness itself is implicated in the development and that reflection is the same on both sides or is one single reflection".⁸¹ To proceed with what Hegel says at the end of the chapter on perception in the *PhS*; "From one and the same point of view, the object is the opposite of itself, for-itself insofar as it is for-an-other, and for-an-other insofar as it is for-itself".⁸²

To reiterate once and for all the general constitution of the object of perception, "it is for-itself as unity within itself in its own determinations, a determinateness which is suitable only to it and which constitutes its essence".⁸³ In addition to this, it also embodies a cumulative of diversities to the extent that these diversities as being-for-another of the object determine it. Nevertheless, it needs to be recalled that these diversities are inessential to the object since any kind of diversity is exterior to the object. Contradiction in its definitive form is apparent once again inside the perceived thing provided that this thing is equal to itself and

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 99.

⁸² Ibid., p. 90.

⁸³ Ibid.

it is concurrently for-itself only in its absolute difference from every other.⁸⁴ For that reason, the object of perception is in a necessary relation with the other things. Such kind of a required association in between the perceived thing and the other things gives rise to an annihilation of the being-for-itself on the side of the perceived thing.

To state what has been discussed until now in a much more neat way, it can be quoted from the *PhS* that: “It is precisely by means of its absolute character and its opposition that the thing relates to others and is essentially only this process relating. But this relation is the negation of its independence, and the thing indeed collapses due to its own essential property”.⁸⁵ As one of the indispensable corollaries of the above clarified dialectic on the affiliation of the perceived object both to itself and to other things, there appears a movement from thing to relation. Hegel’s terms, “What disappear in this movement are the artifices that common consciousness uses to preserve the single and independent thing from...the separation of being being-for-itself and being-for-another”.⁸⁶ Quite the reverse, what specifically appears according to the context of the *PhS* is a notion of relation as the manifestation of the “life of relation”.⁸⁷ Relation signifies “both the separateness and the unity of unity” of the terms such as the following: “unity of unity and multiplicity, identity of identity and non-identity”.⁸⁸ Hence, the debate over perception can be brought to a close by declaring that the perceiving consciousness has been transcended since the thing turns out to be a mere contradiction and it dissolves as the thing equal to itself. It becomes phenomenon.⁸⁹

⁸⁴ Ibid. 90.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 94.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 101.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 121.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

The new object of consciousness is “a universal that is unconditioned by the sensuous”.⁹⁰

This universal denotes nothing other than the emergence of understanding which should be the focus of our study from now on.

Understanding as the Force

Regarding the general condition of the perceiving consciousness, every object perceived was “a thing”. Understanding now has as its object the unconditioned universal which is not a thing.⁹¹ This universal can be defined as “the concept that combines in it the contradictory moments” through which perceiving consciousness becomes conceived in the object and in the subject separately. In other words, perception does not consider in a unity the moment of indifferent thingness expressing itself in a multitude of subsisting differences such as being-for-an-other and being-for-itself.

The effect of the previous dialectic, in compliance with Hegel’s understanding, can be revealed as in the following way. It “has within it the positive signification that in it the unity of being-for-itself and being-for-an-other, the absolute opposition, is immediately posited as one and the same essence”.⁹² As is declared by Charles Andler, who is one of the commentators of the *PhS*, such an elucidation on the result of the experience of perceiving consciousness connotes an expansion into the realm of differences.⁹³ What is more, it also denotes a contraction into the unity of being-for-itself.⁹⁴ These two specificities of the dialectic of perception, expansion into the realm of differences and contraction into the unity of being-for-itself, constitute all the contents and the forms which can appear to consciousness

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid., p. 100.

⁹³ Andler, C., “Le Fondement du Savoir dans la Phenomenologie de l’esprit de Hegel” in *Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale*, XXXVIII, no.3 (July-Sept., 1931), p. 328.

⁹⁴ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 100.

in future.⁹⁵ It needs to be added as a crucial remark that this expansion and contraction can no longer be isolated and posited separately; it is their unity which structures the unconditionality of the universal. To refer to Hegel: “They exist only in this universality these moments can no longer remain apart each other but are in themselves essentially aspects which suppress [*aufheben*] themselves; only their transition into each other is posed”.⁹⁶

The transition mentioned in the above quotation could be described as the very movement of perceiving consciousness. Nonetheless, this movement was not an object for perceiving consciousness. It becomes the object of consciousness whenever consciousness transcends perception and happens to be understanding. This transitory movement is nothing but *force* for understanding though it may appear to understanding as having an objective form at first sight.⁹⁷

Force, by itself, expresses the necessity of the transition from one moment to the other. Force is the collaboration of the unity of itself and its externalization. In positing force, the very unity which is the *concept* is situated.⁹⁸ As is mentioned by Hegel in the following way: “In other words, the differences posed in their independence immediately pass over into their unity, their unity into their unfolding, and this unfolding, in turn, into reduction to unity. It is precisely the movement that we call force”.⁹⁹ In order to comprehend the significance of the concept of force within the context of the *PhS*, the reality of force should be intensely surveyed.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 98.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 103.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 102.

At the beginning pages of the first *Logic*, which is written in Jena, Hegel copes with force whilst deliberating on the category of modality.¹⁰⁰ He defines force driven back on itself or concentrated on itself as possibility.¹⁰¹ At the same time, it can be further added in reference to Hegel that when force succeeds on externalizing itself, it becomes its own reality.¹⁰² Following the argumentation on force proposed in the Jena Logic, force, as the reflection back on itself of sensuous externality, is identical to that externality. On the one hand, the content of force is identical to its presentation. On the other hand, force formally does differ from this presentation. Jena Logic emphasizes that the unity of reality is conceived as force. As a result of such a picture of reality, force allows us to think causality and relation without positing reciprocally external substances. For instance, two bodies attract each other in space or the magnet pulls iron. Vis-à-vis perceiving consciousness, these instances are sufficient enough to denote an external relation amidst two substantialized things. From the standpoint of Hegel, to envision gravitation or magnetism is to grasp relation itself, likewise it is also to conceive the transition from one moment to another as transition.¹⁰³

In order to elucidate on the affiliation between the two diverse concepts (understanding and force), the succeeding statement should be articulated. When the two moments are grasped in their immediate unity as is done by understanding, these distinctive moments do in fact represent differences only for consciousness. Understanding, to which the concept of force belongs, can be accounted as the concept sustaining divergent moments as distinct.¹⁰⁴ To reiterate once more, differences are differences only for consciousness in view of the fact that any moment is surely not distinct from another in force and the force is

¹⁰⁰ Hegel, G. W. F., *Hegel's Science of Logic*, trans. A. V. Miller, Amherst, N. Y.: Humanity Books, 1969, p. 41.

¹⁰¹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 100.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 102.

absolutely identical to its representations.¹⁰⁵ As an important remark, the differences here in question are only in thought. What is more, they are the natural upshots of force driven back on itself and externalized. But the question of how force presents itself to consciousness in reality is still a crucial one to be answered.

First of all, what is meant by declaring that “force presents itself to consciousness but no longer as a concept” needs to be stipulated furthermore. Not only the concept of force but also its reality is posed for the consciousness whenever the moments of force take on a certain kind of independence. However, it can be contended that such independence is contrary to the essence of force since understanding as the current state of consciousness grasps it in unity. Therefore, the reality of force also denotes the following. These moments are suppressed (*aufheben*) themselves as independent and return into unity of concept or of the unconditioned universal.¹⁰⁶ The fact that the permanent object of understanding throughout the whole dialectic is this unconditioned universal should be noted here as an important remark. The concept, for Hegel, “determined as the negative of the force which has a sensuous objectivity” is “force as the latter is in its true essence, that is only object of understanding”.¹⁰⁷ At the proceeding lines of this cited paragraph, Hegel also speaks out more specifically on the status of universal in relation to the concept of force: “The first universal, then is force driven back on itself, or force as substance, but the second universal inside is the inside of things qua inside, which is identical to the concept qua concept”.¹⁰⁸ Before going into any further exploration of the above mentioned second universal à propos of the reality of force, there needs to be much more forethought on the realization of force by consciousness.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 101.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

The experience of consciousness is somewhat noteworthy to spell out at that moment of the argumentation. Consciousness, while making force real, discovers that “the realization of force is at the same time the loss of reality”.¹⁰⁹ To shed some additional light upon the issue, a new conception should be introduced: the play of forces (*Spiel der Kräfte*).¹¹⁰ Throughout the sensuous world, force first opposes an other without which it seems unable to exist. Afterwards, this other appears as another force, and what is then posited is the duality of forces.¹¹¹ Nonetheless, these two forces are only ostensibly independent so long as they presuppose each other. “To every attraction corresponds a repulsion; otherwise, the matter of the whole universe would coagulate at one point”.¹¹² Thus, in compliance with Hegel, the fact that each force presupposes another and is presupposed by it can be validated. As a result of such an occurrence, the play of forces emerges as a mutual relationship through which not only the thought of this play but also the concept of phenomenal reality or the inside of things manages to survive in the everlasting interplay of determinations.

Following these reflections, it can be enunciated that Hegel, in the *PhS*, delicately distinguishes three forms of dialectic as regards the realization of force.¹¹³ The primary one is “force and the other”. The secondary dialectic is “the two independent forces”. Lastly, there is “the reciprocal action of forces, namely the interplay of forces”. To make a start, let us recall once again what force is. “Force is posed as the infinite expansion of itself in the medium of differences”.¹¹⁴ Its existence can be exposed in terms of two moments as force driven back on itself and as force externalized. Force needs an other in order to succeed on establishing these

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 99.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 96.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 97.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

two moments. Another force must approach and call for it to turn in upon itself. In the same way, if force is already posited as reflected back on itself as pure form of possibility, it needs to be steered by an other in order for it to exist as externality.

When the two roles of the other are compared and their resemblance to the two moments of force came into view as significant, it becomes palpable that this other itself needs to be defined as force. Thus, we can speak of two independent forces acting on each other. From the words of Hegel: “force in general has not exceeded the bounds of its concept by the fact that an other exists for it and that it exists for an other. Two forces are present simultaneously. To be sure, the concept of the two is the same but the concept has left its unity to pass over into duality”.¹¹⁵ In reference to Jean Hyppolite, this entire dialectic as regards the being of things for consciousness shows the way for the dialectic of intelligence in the dialectic of the real.¹¹⁶ For Hyppolite, Hegel attempts to find a kind of dialectic in the interplay of dynamic opposing forces. To continue, the genuine meaning of this dialectic emerges as to be for-itself only in the cognizant spirit.

Vis-à-vis the interplay of the two independent forces, it can be put into words that they are interdependent since they have the power of acting on each other. Each vanishes in the other and this movement of disappearance becomes as the only reality of forces having sensuous objectivity.¹¹⁷ Subsequently, there remains nothing other than presentation of force as the phenomenon (*Erscheinung*).¹¹⁸ According to Hegel, the phenomenon has neither consistency nor stability. Only does it refer back to an internal truth that is seemingly hidden beneath the surface. Hence, we come to the second universal as “the inside of things qua inside” over the analysis of the first one as the reality of force. Before going any further on the

¹¹⁵ Ibid., p. 93.

¹¹⁶ Hyppolite, J., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 124.

¹¹⁷ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 100.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 101.

subject of the second universal, the following passage from *PhS* on the concept of *phenomenon* needs to be recollected: “The phenomenon is the movement of being born and of perishing, a movement which itself neither is born nor perishes but which is in-itself, and which constitutes the actuality and the movement of the life of truth”.¹¹⁹ Thus, in reference to the above quoted lines of the *PhS*, it can be maintained that understanding finds the element of truth as opposed to phenomenal presentation.¹²⁰ The negation of the phenomenon is the interior of things. What is insinuated with the conception of the “interior of a thing” can be expressed as in the following way. The interior of a thing is presumed to be beyond the presentation of it from the point of view of understanding. If we accept the argument that Hegel, throughout the *PhS*, attempts to establish how consciousness unfolds itself as self-consciousness on account of a dialectical movement, then it can be contended that Hegel’s entire dialectic is to bring together the phenomenon and the interior of a thing. In the following lines, under what conditions the identification of the sensuous (the phenomenon) and the extra-sensuous (the interior of a thing) becomes possible is under scrutiny.

The phenomenon qua phenomenon, for Hegel, is the extra-sensuous. To express in a different manner, it is the phenomenon viewed as something in the process of vanishing. Hegel comments on the concept as in the following way: “Insofar as it is understanding, consciousness already becomes consciousness of the extra-sensuous, or of the interior of objective Dasein. Yet the extra-sensuous, the external, or whatever we may wish to call it, has no self; it is at first merely the universal which is still far from being spirit that knows itself as spirit”.¹²¹ In order to understand thoroughly the very essence of the concept of extra-sensuous within the Hegelian milieu, we need to have a close look at Hegel’s lectures on the history of

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 33.

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 460.

¹²¹ Ibid.

philosophy where Hegel is highly critical of the idea of a possible intelligible world of which we can well have some notion but no knowledge.

Kant, in the last chapter of his “Transcendental Analytic”, deals with the distinction between *phenomena* name given to the things as they appear to the senses, and *noumena* term used to describe the things as they really are and as they are known to be by the intellect.¹²² For Hegel, at that chapter, Kant in particular persists on the following argument.¹²³ Neither can one take the world of the here-now as a *noumenon*, namely thing-in-itself. Nor is it the case that the thing-in-itself is visible to us via this perceived world. Rather, as soon as we move beyond this world by means of an aggregate of prior rules set by our intellect, there seems to appear an empty place named as the *noumenon* where intellectual representations of things as they are themselves are present.¹²⁴

On the contrary to Kant’s claim, Hegel hypostatizes the idea that to look for something beyond the knowledge of *phenomenon* is nothing but a mere illusion.¹²⁵ However, according to the viewpoint of Hegel, understanding does not yet know the fact that knowledge of the phenomenon is a self-knowledge and therefore it has a truth which is no longer located in the beyond.¹²⁶ Above and beyond these, for Hegel, understanding is still unaware of the fact that there is nothing to be seen behind the curtain which is thought to cover the inside of things. To sum up, in contradistinction to the Kantian approach claiming that there can be no knowledge of the interior due to the limited nature of reason, Hegel disavows knowledge of the interior owing to the nature of the thing.

¹²² Kant, I., *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 33.

¹²³ Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* vol. 3, p. 48.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 102.

As a result of these considerations, the following claim can be averred without hesitation. Consciousness in the form of understanding once more creates an objectified interior for the object of truth in spite of the fact that it reflects back on itself as it does in the state of perception. It distinguishes this reflection of things from its reflection back on itself. In addition to the above mentioned results, the following can be added. Despite the fact that there is no possibility of the knowledge of this interior owing to its position as the beyond of consciousness, Hegel alleges that this interior has been born for us via the mediation of phenomenon.¹²⁷ For Hegel, the extra-sensuous or the interior of things:

[d]erives from the phenomenon, and the phenomenon is its mediation, or, the phenomenon is its essence and, indeed, its fulfillment. The extra-sensuous is the sensuous and the perceived posed as they truly are. But the truth of the sensuous and the perceived is to be phenomenon. Hence the extra-sensuous is the phenomenon qua phenomenon.¹²⁸

Thereby, after having learned that the nature of the interior is posed through the mediation of the phenomenon, consciousness cannot return to the prior states as either sensuous perception or objective force. But rather, we come to see this world “as it genuinely is-as the movement by which it continuously disappears and negates itself”.¹²⁹

The difference has subsistence only throughout such an unstable world of phenomenon.¹³⁰ However, this conception of difference is taken up into thought and become universal as the law of the phenomenon.¹³¹ Consequently, neither the nothingness beyond the phenomenon nor the objective realm of force does represent the universal. The universal carries out differentiation and mediation within itself. Hegel articulates that the conception of

¹²⁷ Ibid., p. 110.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 112.

difference at the core of the universal is the simple image of the phenomenon.¹³² It is expressed in law as the “invariable image of the ever-unstable phenomenon”.¹³³

The concept of law, within the context of *PhS*, can just be described as in the following way. It is the same reproduction of the opposition between force and its externalization at a new level as the unity of the sensuous world. In contrast to force, law is claimed to be a unity both including difference and translating phenomenal movement through the constant of difference.¹³⁴

Nonetheless, as regards Hegel, such kind of a conception of law as the unity of differences conflicts not only with the notion of empirically divergent laws but also with the conception of law itself.¹³⁵ Primarily, a single law can neither succeed in comprising all laws under its own unitary structure. Nor, à propos of the second conflict, can the necessity of the connection among the seemingly distinct terms of the statement of law be validated. Concerning the former conflict, Hegel tries to prove that such kind of a presumption as subsuming all laws under the unity of a single law is a reductionist approach.¹³⁶ Although such a reduction has the merit of setting forth lawfulness as lawfulness, one can only reach as a result of this reductionist approach an abstract formula that entirely obscures the qualitative diversity of the content. Thereby, as is expressed by Hegel in the following remarkable way, “understanding (difference) returns once more into the interior, understood as simple (indivisible) unity. This unity is the internal *necessity* of law”.¹³⁷ In order to understand on

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 113.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

what grounds this unity essential for the explanation of understanding can be established, we need to look into carefully the conception of the “internal *necessity* of law”.

On the question of the necessity of any type of relation, Hegel commences by declaring the ensuing idea. Necessity is: “only substance envisaged as relation or as the being one of the opposite determinations which are not, like material terms that are absolutely for-themselves, absolute substantive terms or qualities, but are in-themselves such as to bear on another, are essentially the opposite of themselves”.¹³⁸

Pertaining to the above citation, identity in the midst of sensuous diversity appears to be a mere formal tautology for understanding.¹³⁹ It can neither modify the multiplicity of terms nor relate substances to each other.¹⁴⁰ The substances remain for-themselves and happen to be connected together from outside.¹⁴¹ At the same time, vis-à-vis Hegel: “This diversity is only a specific being-for-itself of substances; identity and diversity remain external to each other. The relation of diverse substances is in no way necessary, because this relation is not internal to them”.¹⁴²

So as to make the relation of diverse substances internal, it is required that each determination should be conceived as infinite which means to be other than itself.¹⁴³ Henceforth, the concept of relation becomes no longer imposed upon substantialized determinations from the outside. Relation turns out to be the very essence of these determinations. It befalls that relation implies dialectical life. Neither an abstract unity nor an abstract diversity does represent the concept of relation. But rather, in compliance with what has been asserted by Hegel’s early

¹³⁸ Hegel, G. W. F., *Hegel’s Science of Logic*, p. 48.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 48, p. 49.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

writings, relation is their concrete synthesis as “[t]he identity of identity and non-identit[y]”.¹⁴⁴

To sum up, while in quest of the necessity of law, understanding finds the identity of what it has just separated as a difference. Understanding, at a time when it ends up with simple tautologies called necessity, become conscious of the fact that “force is constituted exactly like law...posed as the necessity of law”.¹⁴⁵ It is in itself, besides it remains as what is external to understanding while the differences specifically as the meticulous difference between force in-itself and the law devolve on understanding. As a prominent reminder, we need to add that law endows force with the required means to externalize itself from understanding. In line with the Hegelian lexicon as is used in the *PhS*, the following citation on the issue can be declared: “The differences are pure universal externalization (law) and pure force. But law and force have the same content, the same constitution. Difference, as difference in content, i.e., as difference in the thing, is therefore abandoned once more”.¹⁴⁶

To proceed in connection with the above citation, force as the object in-itself of understanding has the same formation with law whereas it differs from understanding. Nonetheless, such kind of a difference in between understanding and force also connotes a change within understanding so long as “the interior of things is the concept qua concept of understanding”.¹⁴⁷ Moreover, “[t]his change came about for understanding as the law of the understandin[g]”.¹⁴⁸ This difference in between understanding and force disappears at a time

¹⁴⁴ Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion together with a Work on the Proofs of the Existence of God* vol. 2, trans. Rev. E. B. Speirs and J. Burdon Sanderson, London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1968, p. 55.

¹⁴⁵ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 102.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 115.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

when what had been in the beginning accepted merely as a movement of consciousness comes into view as the movement of the thing itself, namely force in-itself.

From an attempt of understanding to give an explanation (*Erklaren*) that is different from its object to the very movement of the object, understanding passes through. Such a transition “from one shore to the other” is one of the most difficult journeys for understanding to follow on account of its dialectic infusing life into the rule of laws for the purpose of completely rejoining it to *phenomena*.¹⁴⁹ It signifies the process of how change of form turns out to be change in content. This is mostly by reason of the fact that the difference between form and content is itself part of this process of change on the side of understanding. However, there emerges a question of “how can the problem of unity be eliminated as is done in the debate of ‘necessity on relation’”. Henceforward, let us deliberate quite a bit on that question.

In the preface to the *PhS*, Hegel establishes an evaluation in opposition to the mathematical science of the universe while seeking for a scientific conception taking account of qualitative difference.¹⁵⁰ For Hegel, mathematics considers the actually real as something spatial whereas “neither concrete sensuous intuition, nor philosophy, burdens itself with such actual nonrealities as mathematical things”.¹⁵¹ In his critique of mathematics, Hegel charges it for being unable to preserve qualitative difference in the system of its equations.

On the subject of the prominence of qualitative difference within the context of *PhS*, it can be stated that “the dialectic is the result of a manipulation of qualitative difference such that difference is forced to its resolution by means of opposition and contradiction”.¹⁵² The dialectic is strictly necessary to resolve the previously asked question of “how the same

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Hegel, G. W. F., *Hegel's Science of Logic*, p. 13.

problem of unity within diversity as in the debate of ‘necessity on relation’ can be eradicated on the procedure of understanding”. Only does the dialectical thought as “the unity of unity and diversity” manage “to attain the change of opposed terms into each other, a change that is qualitative and is immanent movement, self-movement”.¹⁵³ Opposition, under consideration at this juncture, refers to nothing but what is the qualitative.¹⁵⁴ Above and beyond these, “since nothing exists outside the absolute, opposition itself is absolute; only because it is absolute does it suppress itself within itself”.¹⁵⁵ In this way, via introducing contradiction into thought, it can be noted that both “the formalism of explanation”^{*} and “the empiricism of haphazard differences” become avoidable.¹⁵⁶

Do we compare the two occurrences separately, the movement of the interior in contradistinction to the movement of explanation, then we see that the latter is a pure movement while the former lingers unchanged.¹⁵⁷ The pure formal movement of explanation does represent a sort of formalism which already contains what its interior object (in this case the world of laws) is deficient in. It is movement within itself.¹⁵⁸ Nonetheless, in it, “we recognize precisely absolute change itself, the lack of which was felt in law...this movement is immediately its own contrary”.¹⁵⁹ In point of fact, regarded intimately, the movement of explanation generates a difference. However, the difference is of such a nature that it is not a

¹⁵³ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 34.

¹⁵⁴ Hegel, G. W. F., *Hegel's Science of Logic*, p. 13.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

^{*} The formalism of explanation does denote the formal movement of understanding. It refers to a kind of formalism that can be expressed in the abstract equation of $A=A$, in which A is distinguished from A in order then to be identified with it. For Hegel, many explanations that may appear successfully productive turn into a sole production of such kind of formalism. (Please see in; Hegel, G. W. F., *Hegel's Science of Logic*, p. 48.)

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

¹⁵⁷ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 117.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

genuine one and it suppresses itself through the movement of explanation. In other words, this movement quickly identifies what it has just distinguished. As is explained in *Hegel: Three Studies* by Adorno, it is the contentless instability of pure form that is straightway its own contrary.¹⁶⁰ If we attempt to explicate Adorno's statement regarding the previous discussions on formalism, then the following can be enunciated. "A is A" is a phrase that both distinguishes its subject from the object and identifies the two. A is equal to itself and for that reason it not only diversifies with itself but also establishes a union with itself.

Thus, the following questions can be answered. When the difference between content and form has been suppressed through the establishment of the self movement of understanding, what happens to the interior or the content? The experience of understanding divulges that the law of phenomenon represents the emergence of differences.¹⁶¹ However, it turns out that these differences are not actual differences. Likewise, as a result of the experience of understanding, content becomes form namely the opposite of itself and form becomes richer with content. At that moment, "absolute concept" as infinity comes forward.¹⁶² Along these lines, not only does the immediate elevation of the sensuous to the intelligible become achievable. But also, in consequence of this immediate elevation, the experience of "the upside-down world" comes into sight as is explained by Hegel.¹⁶³ However, in accordance with this explanation, it could not be declared that the experience of the inversion of the world does refer to the existence of two distinct worlds. But rather it denotes a dialectical unity in between these two worlds. In order to open up the discussion on the dialectical unity of the two worlds in much more detail for the purpose of validity and clarity, let us scrutinize below the dialectical relation amidst these supposedly distinct worlds.

¹⁶⁰ Adorno, T., *Hegel: Three Studies*, p. 87.

¹⁶¹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 117.

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

Viewed in agreement with the common sense, it may appear that there is one world, the world of *phenomenon* as it is for an-other and another world, the world of in-itself as it is for-itself. In the *PhS*, Hegel states that when from the eye of the common sense a superficial consideration is carried out, the world of *phenomenon* may appear as the inverted actual reality of the intelligible world.¹⁶⁴ Nevertheless, for Hegel:

Such oppositions between inner and outer, between the phenomenon and the supra-sensuous, are no longer present here as oppositions between actual realities of two kinds. Nor do the rejected differences redistribute themselves into two substances that would support them and furnish them a separate substance-in that case, understanding, having emerged from the interior, would fall back to its earlier position.¹⁶⁵

Henceforth, á propos of the above portrayal of the oppositions, it can be further asserted that each determination destroys itself and becomes its other. At this point, the interior becomes fulfilled as *phenomenon*. The difference between *phenomenon* and essence, between apparent meaning and the hidden meaning as the reverse of the apparent meaning, thus destroys itself. The phenomenon appears as the negative, as the difference between itself and itself.¹⁶⁶ Indeed, the primary appearance of the supra-sensuous world can be accounted just as a replica of phenomenon, although it was also the immediate elevation of the perceived world to the universal element. After having reversed or upended itself in-itself in effect as a result of the absolute opposition gained through the mediation of itself in-itself, the supra-sensuous world becomes opposition in-itself, that is, contradiction. In other words, it becomes presentation of essence and just because of such a movement, there are not two worlds but “the intelligible world which is self-presentation of the self”.¹⁶⁷

Thus, with an effort to sum up what has been discussed up to now on the dialectical movement of understanding as the object of knowledge of consciousness, the ensuing phrases

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 97.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 119.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 121.

can be articulated. The fact that the inverted world should not be sought in another world turns out to be obvious. It is present in this world that is both itself and its other at the same time. Besides, it is grasped in its phenomenal entirety as “the absolute concept” or infinity.¹⁶⁸ The unity of which we usually think when we say that difference cannot issue from it happens to be itself a moment of the splitting. Since this unity is a negative, an opposite, it is rightly posed in such a way that includes opposition within itself. Therefore, the differences between the splitting and becoming equal to itself are merely the movement of self-suppression (Aufheben).¹⁶⁹ What we have reached in this way can be described as follows. The being of sensuous certainty unfolds itself as “the absolute concept”. In other words, the former happens to be the genesis of the latter.

Above and beyond these, this dialectic of self-identity within absolute difference appears to consciousness as self-consciousness. By the very fact of the accomplishment of self-consciousness, the I emerges absolutely as the other whereas this other appears as the I. Briefly, consciousness becomes self-consciousness as the truth of itself. At the present time of the discussion, it is noteworthy to shed some light upon the notion of subjectivity hidden beneath the conception of self-consciousness. Thence, the next section of this thesis can be assessed as an analysis carried out in receipt of replies to the major questions that this piece of written work is seeking after. Before going any further, let us go over these questions once again. On what grounds can the entire *PhS* be read as the experience of consciousness? In relation to this, whether it can be acclaimed that the nature of consciousness necessitates the dialectical unfolding of itself as the truth and *PhS* can be described as the presentation of this entire dialectical movement? If so, in what terms can such a necessity immanent to the essence of consciousness be explained? Whether it is possible to claim that Hegel makes use

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 122.

of Aristotle's understanding of the notion of essence while structuring the concept of consciousness?

Self-Consciousness as the Dialectical Movement of Consciousness to Be the Self

Introductory Remarks

Self-consciousness, for Hegel, can reach its truth only by finding another living self-consciousness. The two self-consciousnesses situated at first sight as external to one another give rise to a dialectical movement through which three moments, the battle for recognition, the opposition between master and slave and the liberty of self emerge. Likewise in the case of understanding through which seemingly distinct forces appear as alien to each other whereas they are subdivisions of a unique one, it turns out that the duality embedded within self-consciousness is the result of separation and reproduction of self-consciousness within itself.

At the other sub-sections of this part, the three moments of the dialectical movement of self-consciousness will be analyzed separately for the purpose of presenting the experience of consciousness as pure subjectivity. Throughout such an analysis, the following questions are also to be answered. How do the independence of master and the severe education of the slave lead us to the self-mastery of the stoic or the absolute liberty of the skeptic? In what terms does the truth of this stoic or skeptic liberty come to be expressed as in the state of unhappy consciousness? How does the unhappy consciousness as the representation of the pure subjectivity of the I unfold itself as the consciousness of substance as the pure concept, in other terms being of the self?

Self-Consciousness: the Notion of Desire

To start with, Hegel defines “self consciousness as desire in general”.¹⁷⁰ It is reasonable to ask why self-consciousness is desire in general. In much more contemporary terms, what is the intentionality of this desire? What is the new structure of the subject-object relation that is being described here?

The starting point of this deduction is the presumed opposition between self-knowledge and knowledge of an other. At the last section, we have seen that consciousness realized the object of its knowledge is the I itself. Considering this conclusion, it can be stated that the starting point of the above deduction on the relation of self-consciousness and desire does also depend upon the opposition between self-knowledge and knowledge of an other. Consciousness in its previous stage of sensuous knowledge has the knowledge of the other. Whereas, when it becomes self-consciousness, it happens to be self-knowledge expressed in the identity of I=I (*Ich bin Ich*).¹⁷¹ Self-consciousness is “reflection issuing from the being of the sensuous world and of the perceived world; it is essentially this return into itself starting from being-other”.¹⁷² It can be claimed that the reflection of the I starts with the sensuous world described as the being-other and emerges as the essence of self-consciousness. Thus, it can be further added that self-consciousness exists only if the constant movement of reflecting I happens. In other words, “qua self-consciousness, it is pure movement”.¹⁷³

The movement of self-consciousness, without which it would not exist, requires otherness. To the question of on what grounds the notion of otherness can be explained, the following citation can be given as a reply: “In the first moment self-consciousness exists as consciousness, and the complete extension of the sensuous world is maintained for it, but only

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 124.

¹⁷¹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Hegel's Science of Logic*, p. 55.

¹⁷² Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 100.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

insofar as it is related to the second moment, i.e., the unity of self-consciousness with itself".¹⁷⁴ Otherness that is the world of consciousness is preserved for self-consciousness. Nonetheless, this sort of preservation does not denote a being-in-itself as a passive object of reflection for consciousness but rather a negative object as the object of negation in order for self-consciousness to preserve its own unity.¹⁷⁵ Desire can be described as this movement of consciousness that does not appreciate being but negates it by means of appropriating it concretely.¹⁷⁶ Henceforward, after having viewed this brief introduction, let us scrutinize the concept of desire in a much more thorough way.

Self-consciousness engages in a debate with the world. In this debate, self-consciousness as desire negates and consumes its object in order for its own truth. Thanks to this negation and consummation of the individual object of desire, self-consciousness gathers itself up. Thus, it can be further argued that the existence of the object of desire is dependent upon self-consciousness. Hegel describes the ambiguous relation in the midst of this new structure of consciousness and its object within a quite precise manner as follows:

[c]onsciousness, qua self-consciousness, has a double object: one is the immediate, the object of sensuous certainty and of perception, which for self-consciousness is characterized by negativity (that is, this object is merely phenomenon, its essence being to disappear); the other is precisely itself, an object which is true essence and which is present at first only in opposition to the first object.¹⁷⁷

Following the above citation, self-consciousness is desire and what it desires is its own desire. In other words, it desires its own desire. Self-consciousness "by looking negative in the face, and tarrying with it" succeeds in converting itself into being.¹⁷⁸ Thus, only through finding

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 121.

¹⁷⁶ Hyppolite, J., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 159.

¹⁷⁷ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 127.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 19.

another self-consciousness which is defined in terms of the notion of desire and negating it, can self-consciousness accomplish itself.

On the subject of the other of self-consciousness, it needs to be mentioned that what self-consciousness finds as its other can no longer be the merely sensuous object of perception as is the case with consciousness in the state of understanding. But rather, the new object of consciousness, namely the other of self-consciousness, should be an object that has already reflected back on itself. If we turn back to *PhS* in order to validate what has been thus far contended, then the following citation is in need of declaration:

Through such a reflection back on itself the object has become life. That which self-consciousness distinguishes from itself by considering it as an existent not only has, insofar as it is posed as an existent, the mode of sensuous certainty and of perception, but also is being reflected back on itself; the object of immediate desire is some living thing.¹⁷⁹

Taking into consideration the above quotation, living thing and so thus the life itself appear as the intermediary through which self-consciousness experiences and seeks itself. At the level of self-consciousness, truth is possible only as a truth that experiences and manifests itself in the midst of life.¹⁸⁰ Thus, life in a general sense of the term turns out to be the other of self-consciousness.

Consciousness having life as its object throughout its experience of self-consciousness presumes an opposition in between life and itself. Life as a consequence becomes the only substance, the other of self-consciousness, in such a way that it emerges as another self-consciousness for the I. Self-consciousness opposes universal life and contends that it is independent of it. What is more is an attempt of self-consciousness to situate itself as for-itself within its relation to life. However, for Hegel, “Self-consciousness which exists uniquely for itself and which immediately characterizes its object as negative -self-consciousness which is

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 127.

¹⁸⁰ Hyppolite, J., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 161.

at first desire- will experience instead the independence of that object”.¹⁸¹ Thus, it can be further added that the previous citation implies a dialectical movement from desiring self-consciousness to the multiplicity of self-consciousnesses. This experience by way of which self-consciousness apprehends the independence of the object of desire indicates a new dialectical movement: recognition.¹⁸²

The Struggle for Recognition: The Dialectic of Master and Slave

Consciousness as a result of its above stated dialectical movement experiences a new state where the concept of the mutual recognition of self-consciousnesses is established.¹⁸³ This experience expresses the emergence of self-consciousness into the medium of life. With the intention of giving a portrayal of such an emergence, the following can be articulated. Each self-consciousness is for-itself and, *per se*, it negates all otherness. It is desire but rather that kind of a desire which places itself in its own absoluteness. At the same time, it becomes also for-an-other, in other terms for an other self-consciousness. According to Hegel, “the movement, thus, is wholly and simply the movement of two self-consciousnesses. Each sees the other do what it does itself; each does what it requires of the other and therefore does what it does insofar as the other does it too”.¹⁸⁴ Along the lines of the above reference to *PhS*, self-consciousness exists. Even so, only if self-consciousness gains for itself recognition from another self-consciousness and takes for granted recognition to the other self-consciousness, does it come to exist as what it is for-itself.¹⁸⁵ This is the definition for mutual recognition through which individuals reciprocally recognize each other. On account of the mutual recognition of the opposed self-consciousnesses, there emerges a medium in which the subject

¹⁸¹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 110.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

becomes an object to itself and finds itself completely in the other. On the other hand, it should not be disregarded that self-consciousness as the subject does not eradicate the otherness required for its own existence.

Self-consciousness is “the concept of infinity realizing itself in and by consciousness”.¹⁸⁶ Such a claim seems to me to be significant to the extent that it signifies the movement in the course of which each element itself becomes infinite and comes out both as the other and the self. In contradistinction to the development of life upon where this dialectic about opposed self-consciousnesses is also noteworthy as regards the state of in-itself, self-consciousness at this moment opposes itself within being and afterwards recognizes itself in this opposition within the unity.¹⁸⁷ Following this, it can be emphasized that self-consciousness exists not only as a positive reality, a *Dasein* that disappears and dies absolutely as a result of the pressure employed by what exceeds it and remains external to it.¹⁸⁸ But it is also the case that self consciousness emerges in the middle of this positive reality, *Dasein*, by means of negating itself and maintaining its own unity within that negation. To sum up the discussion in compliance with Hegel:

the discrete figure which is merely alive also suppresses its own independence in the very process of life, but when its difference ends, it ceases to be what it is. The object of self-consciousness, on the contrary, is equally independent in this negativity of self, and is thus for itself genus, universal fluidity in the particularity of its own differentiation: this object is a living self-consciousness.¹⁸⁹

Before proceeding with the analysis of the struggle for recognition in between “master” and “slave” so as to explicate the two moments of self-consciousness as self and life, let us scrutinize quite a bit more upon the current dialectic of self-consciousness.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 115.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 112.

The entire dialectic on the opposed self-consciousnesses takes for granted such conceptual elements as “other” and “self”, besides it structures itself upon them.¹⁹⁰ To reiterate once again, human desire comes into view as soon as it both reflects upon another desire and becomes the desire to be recognized reciprocally. According to Hegel, so long as human beings attempt to find themselves in being and endeavor to make themselves the same as being, they can be named as the being of desire, that is to say, the anxiety of the self. This is “the vocation of man”.¹⁹¹ In order to comprehend why the self experiences such an anxiety, we need to look at how Hegel himself defined the concept of the other in the *PhS*. The other, for Hegel, is “universal life as self-consciousness discovers it, different from itself; it is the element of difference and of substantiveness of differences”.¹⁹² The self as “reflected unity...has become pure negativity” through facing the positive reality of the other.¹⁹³ The self now discovering itself in the other emerges as a particular living figure, another man for man.¹⁹⁴ Not only does the other appear as the same as the self, but also the self is the other. Thus, we see that as regards the experience of the other and the self, the element of duality (otherness) is also required to grasp their unity. However, with the intention of being au fait with the duality of the I in a much more thorough way, let us keep going on with the analysis of the struggle for recognition in between “master” and “slave”.

While continuing his debate on life, Hegel mentions that life, though it is the natural position of consciousness, signifies independence without absolute negativity.¹⁹⁵ From this perspective, the experience of self-consciousness can be reiterated as follows. As is

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 118.

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 116.

mentioned previously, we know that the essence of self-consciousness is being-for-itself in its purity, the negation of all otherness.¹⁹⁶ In order to present itself, self-consciousness as a particular living thing at the heart of universal life becomes directed against a plurality of self-consciousnesses. It sees in the other only a particular figure of life provided unless the other too presents itself as in the form of pure self-certainty.¹⁹⁷ Thus, self-consciousness fails to attain its own truth and therefore its certainty remains subjective. In order for self-consciousness to satisfy the condition of truth, the self and the other must recognize each other mutually not only as living things but also as beings.¹⁹⁸ Taking into consideration a particular living figure as man, Hegel states that “The individual who has not risked his life can of course be recognized as a person, but he does not attain the truth of this recognition of an independent self-consciousness”.¹⁹⁹

Human existence is the existence of the being who is continually desire and who desires for mere desire.²⁰⁰ Human life appears as of a different order from the *Dasein* of life. He or she is capable of risking his life and in this manner freeing himself or herself from the only possible slavery as the enslavement of life.²⁰¹ Thus, the struggle for recognition emerges as a category of historical life. It becomes a condition of human experience. The experience of self-consciousness as the struggle for recognition leads us to another experience which is on the relations of inequality in recognition. At that moment, there comes to light the experience of mastery and servitude.

¹⁹⁶ Hyppolite, J., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 169.

¹⁹⁷ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 119.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 117.

²⁰⁰ Kojève, A., *Introduction to the Readings of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. H. N. James, Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1980, p. 143.

²⁰¹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 113.

When two self-consciousnesses confront each other in the state of the self and the other, one of the self-consciousnesses rises above animal life via succeeding over the fear of death. This is the noble consciousness named as the “master”.²⁰² Its essence is determined through the abstract being-for-itself and thereby it succeeds in escaping the enslavement to life. The other self-consciousness prefers life instead of the independence of self-consciousness. In other words, it chooses slavery.²⁰³ It recognizes a master but the reverse case is not possible. Thus, the two opposing moments of self-consciousness as the self and the other existing previously within a unity dissociate at that time. The slave as the other is a consciousness too. Nonetheless, it is the consciousness of life as positivity in the element of being and in the form thingness. To conclude, it can be claimed that the relation amidst the master and the slave refers to a historically significant new form of life as the newly emerging shape of consciousness.

In this new experience of the self-consciousness, we can say that the master is representative of the immediate abstract self-consciousness. On the other hand, the slave depicts the mediation essential to self-consciousness. In other words, the medium of life appears as the specific figure of the slave, whereas the master happens to be the immediate self-consciousness. In the previous experience, the life element was the only form for the appearance of differentiated self-consciousnesses. However, as a result of its present dialectical movement, self-consciousness comes into sight within a new integrated shape. To sum up what has been articulated up to now, the two moments of self-consciousness as the self and the life confront each other in that new shape of consciousness. Henceforth, we can proceed with the explanation of how the current dialectical movement of consciousness forming its new shape proceeds.

¹⁹² Ibid., p. 114.

²⁰³ Ibid.

Before starting, it is noteworthy to remark once again the fact that the dialectic of domination and servitude expounded in the *PhS* under the part on self-consciousness represents the individual development of self-consciousness.²⁰⁴ As is mentioned before, the being of the slave is life and therefore independence of slave is posited as external to him in life. In contradistinction to that, the master has succeeded in raising himself above life and started to consider life as a mere phenomenon so as to be negated. Servile labor of the slave arranges the world in order for the master to arrange the world as he/she pleases.²⁰⁴ Hence, the master enjoys the world and he/she^h has the chance of negating it. Nevertheless, his/her seemingly immediate self-certainty on this world of plurality is in fact mediated through the presence of the slave. It turns out to be that recognition is just one-sided. Only does the slave have the capacity of acting on him/herself. To mean it in a different manner, he/she is capable of recognizing him/herself. Just like mediation which has been realized by a consciousness other than that of the master, the truth of the master's consciousness lies in the consciousness of the slave.²⁰⁵ However, there emerges a contradiction as regards the issue of the truth of self-consciousness. Consciousness of the slave, which is alien to itself by the very reason of the fact that its being is posited outside of it, needs to be taken under consideration for the sake of answering the question of on what grounds it can be accounted as the truth of reality.

As a reply to our recently asked question, primordial fear, service and labor must be present within the existence of the slave's consciousness in order to imprint the true form of consciousness.²⁰⁶ Through the fear of death, the master appears as truth in the slave despite the fact that he/she is external to the being of the slave. The master does not feel the fear of death. Besides, he has the power of elevating him/herself immediately above all the

²⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 111.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 116.

vicissitudes of existence. In contradistinction to the circumstance of the master, the slave experiences the fundamental anguish of death since all that was stable within him has been shaken. By this elemental anguish, he/she perceives his/her essence as a whole. “But such a pure and universal moment, such an absolute dissolution of all subsistence, is the simple essence of self-consciousness, pure negativity, pure being-for-itself”.²⁰⁷ Therefore, consciousness of the slave develops as pure being-for-itself.

In addition to the fear of death, the slave, by means of service, gradually eliminates all his/her adherence to natural *Dasein*. In the particular service of the master, consciousness of the slave disciplines itself in order to succeed in detaching him/herself from *Dasein*. As the last component required for elevating consciousness of the slave up into the status of independence, we see labor. It is labor that transforms servitude to mastery.²⁰⁸ Only the slave can transform the world and thus make it adequate to the desire of consciousness. Through the action of labor, the slave, likewise being-in-itself, becomes capable of making his own being-for-itself subsistent and permanent. Moreover, the slave not only shapes himself by learning to shape things, but also he/she determines the form of self-consciousness on being. Hence, in the product of his/her work, the slave attains himself/herself as well as the contemplation of independent being. In other words, the slave succeeds in realizing his/her own being-for-itself in being-in-itself by means of his/her own labor. Henceforth, being-in-itself as the being of life unites itself with the being-for-itself of consciousness. Hegel’s terms, laboring consciousness comes to the intuition of independent being as an intuition of itself.²⁰⁹ In this way, stoicism as the newly emerging experience of consciousness manifests to us the truth of this intuition of self newly coming in being-in-itself.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 117.

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 120.

The Liberty of Self-Consciousness:
Transition from Stoic and Skeptic Consciousnesses to the Unhappy Consciousness

The Stoic Consciousness

At the end of the preceding section, we see that self-consciousness is no longer a mere instantaneous reflection emerging from life but rather it is henceforward a thinking intuitive self-consciousness. In other words, it can be claimed that the stage reached as a result of the previous experience of consciousness does belong to the realm of thought.²¹⁰ For the purpose of realizing the thorough meaning of the former claim, let us recall quite a bit the prior stage of consciousness.

To start with, the essence of the slave's consciousness is being-for-itself so long as the slave takes into account the master's consciousness as its ideal. Nonetheless, the slave is forced to stay dependent upon that ideal. Depending upon the fact that "the form of self-consciousness as the form of the thing that is formed appears in the being of things", the following statement can be asserted. Only through his own labor, the slave's consciousness appears to itself as an object in the element of being. Then, the slave is unable to recognize that this form of consciousness represents consciousness itself since he separates the moment of the master's consciousness as being external to the slave from that of the form of the labored things. At that moment, there emerges a divergence in between the consciousness of the slave and that of the phenomenologist. The latter who philosophizes on the issue of the development of consciousness believes that the universal form of self-consciousness gradually appears in human labor, while the former separates the being-in-itself from the products of his/her labor.

From the perspective of the phenomenologist, self-consciousness is now thinking self-consciousness provided that "being-in-itself, or thingness, which received form through labor,

²¹⁰ Ibid., p. 127.

is a substance in no wise different from consciousness”.²¹¹ What does thinking self-consciousness mean? Primarily, for Hegel, to think is to make real the unity of being-in-itself and being-for-itself. In other words, it is to put together being and consciousness since: “to think means to be an object to oneself, not as an abstract I but as an I which at the same time has the signification of being-in-itself; or so to relate to objective essence that it have the signification of the being-for-itself of consciousness, for which it is”.²¹² For the purpose of poring much more over the above mentioned definition of thought, the following assessment can be expressed. In order to be the thinking self-consciousness, the I must both acquire subsistence so as to become its own object and justify that the being of life is its own being instead of the being of life. Hegel’s terms, “to think is to conceive, and the concept is simultaneously a distinct being-in-itself and my pure being-for-me”.²¹³

Moreover, thinking self-consciousness is free self-consciousness.²¹⁴ Hegel defines freedom in such a way that thought and will become identified.²¹⁵ Besides, thought is will to the degree that it is the self positing of the self.²¹⁶ As regards will, it is thought insofar as will is the knowledge of itself in its object.²¹⁷ Neither by way of servitude nor through domination, can freedom become attainable. Freedom, within the context of stoicism, is possible only by means of having thought capacities at all circumstances. As a result of an identity of thought and will, there comes into view stoic liberty.

Thus, for the stoic liberty, the major target becomes the identity of thought with itself. However, such an evaluation on the liberty of the stoic does point out another feature of

²¹¹ Ibid., p. 130.

²¹² Ibid., p. 131.

²¹³ Ibid., p. 132.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid., p. 133.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ Ibid., p. 135.

his/her freedom. If the stoic, desiring to live in accord with nature, finds as unimportant the concrete situation in which he is posited; then it is not erroneous to say that self-consciousness of the stoic stays indifferent to natural *Dasein* while attempting to gain its liberty.²¹⁸ In other words, for the stoic, what appears as important is not what he does or the circumstances in which he is placed. What the stoic cares about as regards freedom is rather the following: the relation between the situation and him/herself. An attempt to rise above all the contingencies and determinations of life is what provides the genuine freedom for the stoic.

Nevertheless, pertaining to these assertions, it can be concluded that the liberty of the stoic remains as an abstract conception of thought lacking actuality. Furthermore, pure form of thought breaks itself away from things and it returns into itself as a result of its detachment from things.²¹⁹ A dichotomy occurs within the reflection of consciousness. The content as the particular determination of the concept appears distinct from the universal form of it. Thus, it is not mistaken to assert as a final conclusion that self-consciousness of the stoic as a thinking will seems to be abstract and results in a separation of thought from the determinations of experience, although the stoic is equipped enough to elevate self-consciousness up into the status of universal form of thought as the form of all determinate content.

The Skeptical Consciousness

In contradistinction to the stoic, the skeptic is the one who penetrates all the determinations of experience and of life. Skepticism, for Hegel, is the “realization of that of which stoicism is merely the concept; it is the actual experience of freedom of thought, a freedom which in-itself is the negative, and which must necessarily present itself as such”.²²⁰ In skepticism, self-

²¹⁸ Ibid.

²¹⁹ Ibid.

²²⁰ Ibid.

consciousness reflects upon itself and vis-à-vis this reflection, the complete inessentiality and dependence of that other becomes present to consciousness.²²¹

Hegel conceives of skepticism as a necessary moment of the development of consciousness. Through skepticism; “thought becomes perfect thought annihilating the being of the multiply determined world, and the negativity of free self-consciousness becomes, at the heart of this multifarious configuration of life, real negativity”.²²² Self-consciousness, thus, reaches absolute certainty of itself.²²³ That is to say, unlike stoicism, skepticism provides self-consciousness with the required means to posit itself through the actual negation of all otherness instead of the realm of abstraction. By means of obliterating overall determinations of existence, the skeptic acquires the self-certainty. To show how the skeptic rises above all the vicissitudes of *Dasein*, we need to look at the dialectical movement through which skepticism passes.

As regards skeptic consciousness, it can be argued that the very experience of the dialectic has become a moment of self-consciousness.²²⁴ Contrary both to sensuous consciousness assuming that truth can be obtained through the immediate “here” and to perceiving consciousness positing the thing outside of its properties, skepticism reveals the very details of its experience of liberty. Neither sensuous consciousness nor perceiving consciousness is aware of the actual fact that consciousness can understand in what way the true for it is possible. Only the skeptic self-consciousness, in the certainty of its own freedom, can eliminate the other that tries to pass itself off as real.²²⁵ Thus, the point of fact that nothing subsists except absolute certainty can be further maintained. The I becomes the source for all

²²¹ Ibid., p. 136.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Ibid.

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ Ibid., p. 137.

values and positions Moreover, the skeptic self-consciousness, hence, turns out to be the very foundation of subjectivity that is presented in the following negative action. It is certain of itself through the annihilation of all the forms of being.

Nevertheless, the strength of the skeptic consciousness can be accounted at the same time as its weakness. Regarding what has been asserted thus far above, the purely negative action of the skeptic results from a dialectical movement that provides him/her with the sufficient means to be absolutely self-certain. As a matter of fact, the skeptic remains caught under the conditions of the concrete situations although these circumstances are the very source of his/her experience within which consciousness immerses its own being by presenting inessential differences and pure contingencies. The contradiction of skeptical consciousness obviously lies in here. Whenever the skeptic rises above all of the vicissitudes of natural *Dasein* through the act of negation, his/her very existence happens to be at the same time reliant upon these pure contingencies. His/her unassailable certainty gets in touch with temporary life so long as the very foundation of the skeptic's consciousness necessitates an aggregate of contingent circumstances in order to bring forth its own being. So as to overcome the contradiction immanent to its characteristics, the subjectivity of self-consciousness must be beyond life while remaining in it. Thus, to conclude upon what has been declared up to now within a much more precise way, the truth of this skeptical consciousness is unhappy consciousness.

Unhappy Consciousness

Before going into the very details of the issue, the fact that unhappy consciousness is the unfolding of consciousness needs to be put into words as a concise remark as regards the conception of unhappy consciousness. In compliance with this statement, it is noteworthy to have in mind the point that self-consciousness, which has been accomplished as subjectivity in the previous section of this part, is constituted as truth. Nevertheless, self-consciousness

realizes its own inadequacy to reach this truth at its present stage. In other words, to reach a unity with itself as a result of its reflection upon itself becomes an unattainable goal for self-consciousness at the stage of skepticism. Afterwards, it experiences “pain concerning a split of that *Dasein* and of the self” and thus fails to identify its own being with life.²²⁶

Consciousness in the status of unhappy consciousness becomes aware of the fact that its “contrary is essence and that it is nothing”.²²⁷ The misfortune of unhappy consciousness is the consequence of that awareness of a discrepancy in the middle of the life and the self. This feeling of disparity imbedded to the unhappy consciousness is, for Hegel, the essence of subjectivity.²²⁸

At the outset, unhappy consciousness as consciousness of both life and what exceeds life expresses in essence subjectivity aspiring to the repose of unity. It portrays the for-itself as opposed to the in-itself or, as is articulated by Hegel, it describes specificity as opposed to universality.²²⁹ Along these lines, unhappy consciousness can also be described as the consequence of self-certainty’s attempt to be its own truth for itself.²³⁰ However, in compliance with Hegel, the following statement can be avowed. Self-certainty defined as the for-itself is precisely incapable of attaining itself.²³¹ Let us take a look at the steps of such an attempt on the side of self-certainty and its effects as regards the evolution of consciousness.

So as to comprehend thoroughly the recently unfolding shape of consciousness, the unhappy consciousness, in relation to its previously presented shapes, we can start with making a brief summary of the transition from stoicism to unhappy consciousness. Any

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Ibid., p. 138.

²²⁹ Ibid.

²³⁰ Ibid.

²³¹ Ibid., p. 135.

concrete situation of the master and the slave can be accounted as redundant for the self-consciousness of the stoic who is free of all the determinate situations that may arise. As soon as the stoic consciousness comes into appearance, the dialectic of master and slave becomes resolved by internalizing and locating the problem immanent to the self-consciousness of the stoic. Thus, the stoic claims to bring into actual reality the pure free I whose truth is then discovered in the dialectic of the skeptic.

Nevertheless, the skeptic consciousness is never at rest and continually experiences anxiety as well as instability. It transcends the concrete situations and experiences that it comes across. From the words of Hegel: “even for itself, this new figure of consciousness is thus the split consciousness that it has of itself; as a consciousness liberating itself, immutable, and equal to itself, and as a consciousness absolutely entangled in its confusion and self-reversals”.²³² As we have already learned from the restless oscillation of skeptic consciousness that consciousness can not pose itself without the other, reflection splits from life while contraposing essence to non-essence. The skeptic consciousness deems life as devoid of essence and therefore contraposes it to infinity. On the other hand, life as the separated infinity exists only in the specificity of self-consciousness. In other words, it turns out that the very consciousness of the skeptic is bound to the contingencies of life and it is affected by the consciousness of life. As is mentioned in the *PhS*:

In this way, the splitting that attributed the respective roles to two specific beings-the master and the slave-comes to be situated in only one. The split of self-consciousness within itself, a split essential to the concept of spirit, is by that very fact present, but the unity of that duality is not yet present; and unhappy consciousness is self-consciousness as split essence, as yet only entangled in contradiction.²³³

²³² Ibid., p. 131.

²³³ Ibid., p. 129.

Unlike spirit within which opposition entails unity and unity entails opposition, the opposition is immanent to the very essence of unhappy consciousness as yet for-itself.²³⁴ The new shape of consciousness as unhappy consciousness is not able to pose itself absolutely in unity. In analogy with the separation amidst the master and the slave, the first form of opposition within unhappy consciousness is between the immutable and the changeable, namely between essence and non-essence. Before getting into a scrupulous analysis of this opposition, let us initially define what is called the changeable and the immutable respectively.

Skeptical consciousness discovers the vanity of its particular life, when it becomes unhappy consciousness.²³⁵ The consciousness of its presence in the world at the same time appears as the consciousness of the nothingness of that particular and changeable situation.²³⁶ In contradistinction to the condition of unhappy consciousness, the other consciousness as the consciousness of an immutable and simple self-certainty is posed as essence beyond changeable and manifold non-essential life. Thence, unhappy consciousness, which is the changeable having no essence, appears as the consciousness of its own contradiction so long as it becomes conscious of the fact that it can neither attain essence nor have it.²³⁷⁻²³⁸ If the ideal is posed within unhappy consciousness, then what is named as ideal can no longer be the ideal. Besides, the ideal becomes unachievable by unhappy consciousness insofar as it is posited outside of it.

With regard to the explication of the figure of immutable, Hegel, in order to discuss the issue within the limits of a rather concrete example, transposes a historical category into a

²³⁴ Ibid., p. 134.

²³⁵ Ibid., p. 136.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Ibid., p. 137.

²³⁸ Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion together with a Work on the Proofs of the Existence of God* vol. 2, p. 101.

religious one: the dialectic of master and slave which is immanent to unhappy consciousness. According to Hegel, Judaism, as the consciousness of the separation of man and God (the unhappy consciousness), leads the way to Christianity, as the consciousness of their union (the concept).^{239-*} As a result of such a transition, the meaning of unhappy consciousness evolves in such a manner that it becomes identified with specific existence itself whereas, formerly, it is the consciousness of a life whose essence it could not contain but had to seek in a transcendent term, namely, in “an entity beyond being”.²⁴⁰ Thence, unhappy consciousness emerges as the notion of subjectivity that no longer lacks essence but “that essence is the inaccessible beyond which eludes the gesture that seeks to grasp it, or, more precisely, which has always eluded it”.²⁴¹ Furthermore, in consequence of the transition of unhappy consciousness from “an entity beyond being” to “an entity joined to being”, unhappy consciousness discovers itself as the movement that overcomes the duality immanent to its characteristics. Thenceforth, not only does unhappy consciousness undertake its ascent to the immutable. But also such a dialectical movement of consciousness rising up to itself emerges as both that consciousness and consciousness of the immutable by the very fact that the immutable enters into consciousness.²⁴²

Regarding the above mentioned lines, it can be declared that such an ascent to immutable emerges as consciousness itself. The immutable then can only be attainable in the middle of specific existence of unhappy consciousness and just like the reverse case, the

²³⁹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p. 349.

* For Hegel, The Jewish people are the unhappy people of the human history because of the fact that their way of life represents the first total reflection of consciousness away from life. The Jewish people, according to Hegel, can only oppose itself continuously to nature and to life. Though Judaism is the religion of the sublime and of the separation of man from God, it prepares the way for Christianity as the reconciliation between the self and the life. (Please see in; Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion together with a Work on the Proofs of the Existence of God* vol. 2, p. 136.)

²⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 122.

²⁴¹ Ibid., p. 138.

²⁴² Ibid.

unhappy consciousness is at the heart of the immutable, becomes realizable. Instead of specific existence of unhappy consciousness, having been destroyed in the consciousness of the immutable, the immutable continually reappears in it.²⁴³ Afterwards, the immutable can no longer be described in terms of the transcendent pole tied to the contradiction imbedded within unhappy consciousness. But rather, from the viewpoint of the Hegelian analysis contained within the *PhS*, the immutable appears as the pure concept adjacent to being uniting the essence with the non-essence.²⁴⁴

At the end of the aforementioned discussion upon the emergence of self-consciousness as the knowledge of its own, what we have attempted to justify can be summed up as follows. Consciousness at the stage of self-consciousness finds its new true object as the pure concept of being issuing from its own dialectical movement called experience. This seems to me to be a necessary consequence of the notion of consciousness since the true as the whole, for Hegel, “is nothing other than the essence consummating itself through its own development”.²⁴⁵ Following this quotation, on my own view, such a conception of essence necessitates the development of consciousness in such a way that consciousness appears to be established as the truth of its own subjectivity. Additionally, I maintain the view that the notion of essence not only points out what for this development is carried out but also it defines the very being of the voyager, namely consciousness, throughout the route. In consequence, it becomes reasonable for me to argue that owing to the Hegelian conceptualization of essence, the formal cause of the Hegelian consciousness coincides with its final cause. This is the case insofar as we define the former as the very definition of substances whereas the latter is described in terms of causation. Thus, there emerges another claim of mine. If we accept that

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 11.

the above assumed notion of essence is true with regard to Hegel's employment of the term within the *PhS*, then it can be added into the bargain that Hegel borrows the notion of essence from Aristotle.

Henceforward, in the next part, for the sake of the justification of the following view that Aristotelian notion of essence carries out a teleological dimension as is used by Hegel in the *PhS*, I will try to elaborate upon the notion of essence within the limits and determinations of the Aristotelian terminology. To reiterate what has been uttered at the beginning once more, the elaboration as regards the next part of this thesis will be carried out for the purpose of validating the argument that overall *PhS* can be described as the teleological unfolding of consciousness.

CHAPTER II:

ON HEGEL'S EVALUATION OF THE ARISTOTELIAN NOTION OF ESSENCE WITH RESPECT TO HIS OWN CONCEPTION OF CONSCIOUSNESS:

As is mentioned above, at the present part of this thesis, the view that Aristotelian essences are inherently teleological will be validated for the purpose of justifying the foremost thesis of this written work as such that the *PhS* can be accounted as “the unfolding of the notion of consciousness through the establishment of knowledge”. The very essence of the Hegelian conception of consciousness, on my view in compliance with the *PhS*, both carries out its own end immanently in itself and it therefore necessarily causes the development of consciousness itself in the way of knowledge. In this regard, it is not invalid to preserve the view that the Hegelian conception of consciousness takes its start on the most part from the Aristotelian notion of essence. Along these lines, the below will represent Aristotle's analysis of the notion of essence in relation to his views upon teleology. Please also keep in mind the following prominent remark. Although we are aware of the fact that the below discussions vis-à-vis Aristotle's assessment of the notion of essence are themselves apt to be the fundamental subject of a thesis project, only Hegel's approach towards these issues is in question with reference to his own conception of consciousness for the purpose of the current project.

The Aristotelian Conception of Telos

In Physics II.3, Aristotle, while giving an enumeration of the four causes, lists matter, form, the efficient cause and the final cause by asserting the idea that “[a]nd again, a thing may be a cause as the end. That is what something is for, as health may be what a walk is for”.²⁴⁶ Following this assertion, Aristotle further declares that the student of nature, who is studying the inner principle of motion and rest possessed by natural beings, should be aware of all of

²⁴⁶ Aristotle, *Physics*, trans. R. Waterfield, Oxford, N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1996, § 194b33-34.

the four causes in case of replying to the question of why.²⁴⁷ What he is in mind can be described as in the following way. What a thing is and what it is for coincides in the case of explaining natural beings. In other words, for Aristotle, the definition of a natural being as its formal cause becomes identified with its goal as the final cause.

As regards the above articulated ideas of Aristotle on the credibility of a unity amidst final and formal causes of natural things, let us give some examples. Activities of living beings as well as the evolution of a bodily organ can be interpreted from a teleological worldview in such a way that their ends and forms can be united. Regarding an activity, how it is contributed to other activities that are central to a being of that kind is under scrutiny. The stalking behavior of a carnivore can be described as a behavior carried out for the sake of nutrition which is on the definition a core activity of animals.²⁴⁸ Concerning a bodily organ such as the eye, we know that eyes exist for the sake of sight as the central element in their definition. Thence, it can be concluded that one can and should explain what an organ is in terms of the function it has to perform. To mean it in a different manner, a bodily organ ought to be explained functionally à propos of an activity that is deemed as the end of that organ.²⁴⁹

What is more concerning the aforementioned specificity of any teleological explanation as regards the generation of natural beings, Aristotle adds into the bargain the following view that there is an evaluative aspect of teleological argumentation.²⁵⁰ Attributable to the fact that Aristotle, in the first book of *Metaphysics*, defines natural changes as occurrences representing inherently the goodness and beauty, it is significant to bear in mind that he describes the goal or end of a change in value language as the good.²⁵¹ From the words

²⁴⁷ Ibid., § II.7.198a17-22.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., § 199a31-33.

²⁴⁹ Aristotle, *Parts of Animals*, trans. A. L. Peck, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961, § 639b14-21.

²⁵⁰ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, trans. H. Lawson-Tancred, London: Penguin Books, 1998, § I-984B8-14.

²⁵¹ Ibid., § 983a31-32.

of Aristotle's own, "Things manifest goodness and beauty both in their being and in their coming to be".²⁵²

However, there emerges a question of on what grounds natural beings exhibit goodness and beauty, as well as the question of in what terms we can argue that some ends are necessarily responsible for the behavior of natural beings. Regarding the former query, let us consider the example of the generation of an animal. The form or the design of an animal can be evaluated as good in the sense of "good for that animal".²⁵³ That is to say, the process toward the actualization of that form or design is a process toward a good. The design is good for the animal so long as it is best or well-suited for the range of activities that are constitutive of the essence of an animal of that kind and that the animal engages in.

Regarding our inquiry on the latter question of upon what justification some ends are necessarily accountable as the causes of the forms of natural beings, please consider the following instance of the phenomenon of rainfall and its relation to the growth of corn.²⁵⁴ Aristotle avers that rain falls in consequence of a series of events caused by a succession of material efficient factors such like evaporation of water, coldness of it and falling of rain.²⁵⁵ The fact that rainfall results in the growth of corn although it seems to be a mere coincidence, does actually for Aristotle carry out an end inherently. In spite of the fact that the falling of rain according to this example is fully necessitated by material factors, watering corn is the sort of event that can occur for an end since it is good for the corn. What is coincidental in line with Aristotle is not the fall of rain but rather its beneficial effect on the corn. Since the rain did not fall in order to accomplish that end, it can be accounted coincidental. The

²⁵² Ibid., § 988b6-16.

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Aristotle, *Physics*, § 198b17-20.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., §198b24-29.

conjunction of two events such as falling rain and flourishing corn is coincidental in lieu of the occurrences themselves. Thus, an event cannot be accounted as coincidental whenever it does happen for the end result. Nor can any coincidental event be contrasted with what is the necessary.

In compliance with the aforementioned views of Aristotle on the necessary and coincidental nature of material occurrences, his critique in opposition to pure explanation of natural events in terms of material-efficient causation can be asserted as follows. Nonetheless, before going into very details of this issue so as to explicate thoroughly Aristotle's identification of final and formal causes, let us first of all describe in detail the rival account. In accordance with a purely materialist account against which Aristotle will argue, natural phenomena such as the formation of animal parts can be fully explained in terms of material-efficient causation.²⁵⁶ Following this, that the products are useful for the animal or that they function well is purely a matter of coincidence. The processes are such that they might have occurred for that end, but as a matter of fact they do not.²⁵⁷ As a last but not least premise, the explanation for the fact that there are many examples of this sort of coincidence around us (such as useful organs) is the following. On the one hand, those animals with organs that are unable to contribute to their good do not survive. On the other hand, those animals with organs that do happen to contribute to their good burgeon.²⁵⁸

Contrary to these lines of reasoning, Aristotle proposes the following counter way of argumentation.²⁵⁹ All things as well as such processes like the formation of teeth in animals,

²⁵⁶ Ibid., § 198b29-32.

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

²⁵⁹ Ibid., § 198b33-a8.

which are owing to nature, always come to be as in the way that they do.²⁶⁰ In reference to this, nothing which is the outcome of luck, coincidental or the automatic always comes to be. Things happen either coincidentally or for the benefit of something.²⁶¹ Thence, the natural phenomena occur for something.²⁶² Furthermore, the “for something” or end is present in things which are and which come to be owing to nature since all parties to the dispute say that the phenomena under discussion are owing to nature.²⁶³

Regarding the conclusion of the argument, it is not unsound to make such a comment that formal and final causes operate together in natural beings. Moreover, Aristotle shows us that an account on mere material necessitation is not causally sufficient to describe natural processes. Rather, another causal factor is at work à propos of these procedures. On the issue of the nature and natural phenomena, Aristotle thinks that goals or ends are responsible for the matter and responsible for the process as a whole. In the ensuing section of this part, an endeavor to sustain the standpoint that “Aristotle’s argument for teleology constitutes his principal argument for forms or essences” will be accomplished. With reference to this view, the argument that “Aristotle’s identification of formal and final causes in the case of natural beings gives their forms, or essences, a teleological dimension” will be additionally examined.

The Aristotelian Notion of Essence

At the outset of the *Metaphysics* VII, the notion of essence is introduced as in the following way:

Since in the beginning we distinguished in how many ways we define substance, and since one of these seemed to be the essence we must investigate this. And first let us say some things about it linguistically. The essence of each thing is what it is said to be *per*

²⁶⁰ Aristotle, *De Anima: On the Soul*, trans. H. Lawson-Tancred, Harmondsworth, N. Y.: Penguin Books, 1986, p. 185.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² Aristotle, *Physics*, § 198b29-32.

²⁶³ Ibid.

se. For being you is not being musical, since you are not *per se* musical. What, then, you are *per se* is your essence.²⁶⁴

Although it is not mistaken to declare that these lines refer to introductory comments of Aristotle on the notion of essence since the rest of *Metaphysics* get in charge with this issue thoroughly, the definition of essence here in relation to the concept of *per se* seems to me to be prominent. Following this quotation, to define essence in terms of the necessary properties of substances becomes plausible. Let us explain below in details on what grounds this is the case.

The specific sense of *per se* predication as is employed by Aristotle in contradistinction to *per accidens* becomes equal to the predications of essence.²⁶⁵ It can be further described in the way that the predicate states the part of the definition of the subject.²⁶⁶ Either the predicate belongs in the definition of the subject, or vice versa, the subject belongs in the definition of the predicate. This form of predication is taken by Aristotle to be the one relevant to the notion of essence insofar as the definition is described as “the statement indicating essence”.²⁶⁷ In compliance with this, it is not unreasonable to assume that the predicates in these *per se* predications referring to the essential properties of the entity are also referred to by the subject term. Furthermore, if we look into the examples as regards *per se* predications with individual subjects in *Metaphysics* V, it can be claimed that an individual’s essence consists of its necessary properties so long as the relationship between an individual substance and its essence can be described by means of a *per se* predication.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁴ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, § 1029b13-16.

²⁶⁵ Aristotle, *De Anima: On the Soul*, § 1.4-73a34-37.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, § 73a34-37.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, § 101b37.

²⁶⁸ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, § VII 1029b13-16.

The crucial question for Aristotle in connection with the notion of essence seems to me to be the one concerning the concept of definition. In *Metaphysics* VII.4, predicating the definition is stated as a form of predication appropriate for talking about essences.²⁶⁹ An answer to the question of what counts as a definition can be given as follows: the definition by genus and differentia.²⁷⁰ For instance, let us examine the ensuing predication that: “Michel is *per se* animal”. In the above statement, the genus as an element hidden under the definition of man is predicated of the subject. Since the property of “being an animal” is necessary to describe Michel, it can be accounted both as a necessary property of Michel and as an essential property of it. With reference to Aristotle, we can state that the definition by genus and differentia places individuals into kinds through making a distinction of the common definitional properties of a number of individuals. Thus, it also succeeds in giving an explanation of a property common to all members of the same kind.

Shortly after having stated introductory remarks quoted above, Aristotle attempts to question in the *Metaphysics* whether “non-substances as the non-*per se* beings have essences at all” is really an argument.²⁷¹ Since each non-substance is innate to a substance, they can be accounted as compounds. In line with this way of reasoning, Aristotle concludes that only substances are primary as well as non-compound and therefore only they have definitions and essences.²⁷²

A prominent consequence as a result of this discussion on the question of whether or not non-substances have essences emerges out. There is no mention of an inquiry in *Metaphysics* VII.4-5 concerning the debate whether “non-substances can be the subjects of

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

²⁷¹ Ibid., § 1029b22-27.

²⁷² Ibid., § 1030a2-7.

per se predications” is really an argument.²⁷³ On the other hand, there is a serious difficulty regarding the question of whether non-substances have definitions and essences or not.²⁷⁴ To mean it in a different way, it seems to me reasonable to claim that Aristotle strictly concerns himself with the issue of making a distinction in between substances and non-substances concerning their definitions and essences rather than *per se* predications.

In line with what has been asserted up to now, the Aristotelian contention on the question of whether non-substantial things do possess definitions or essences leads us to another subject of inquiry. The distinction in this discussion between those entities which have essences and those which do not depends upon whether or not the definition is of a unified *per se* being.²⁷⁵ Pertaining to this point of view, it can be further articulated that essences are correlated with definitions as answers to the questions of “What is it?”.²⁷⁶ What is more is the following line of reasoning. Depending upon the fact that non-substantial beings are intrinsic to substances whereas substances do not inhere in anything, substances are unified *per se* beings rather than compound beings.²⁷⁷ On account of this characterization of substances as the unified objects of definitions, there arises a problem concerning the sensible material substances so long as these substances are defined in terms of composite substances. To put the point another way, if substances are unified beings, then how can sensible or material substances as compounds of matter and form be accounted as substances? What is their principle or cause of unity? It is now time to turn to the text in order to reply to these

²⁷³ Ibid., § 1029b22-1030a6.

²⁷⁴ Ibid.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., § 1030b4-13.

²⁷⁶ Ibid.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

questions by declaring the Aristotelian principle that its form or essence is the cause of being a substance.²⁷⁸

In *Metaphysics* VII.7, Aristotle avows the statement that “Since, therefore, substance is a certain principle and a cause, one must inquire from there”.²⁷⁹ To validate his argument, Aristotle gives two examples through asking the questions of “why man is an animal of such a kind” and of “why these bricks and stones are a house” respectively.²⁸⁰ Each of these questions can be interpreted as in the way that they have the status of a general form for the inquiry of why one thing belongs to another. It is significant to bear in mind that the general form here in question engages with the issue of predication. The former question seems to differ from the latter one to the extent that the issue of why a property applies to a substance is under scrutiny in the first one. Whereas, à propos of the second one, the subject of whether some matter composes an object of a determinate kind is investigated.

The question of “why these bricks and stones are a house” is asked in an attempt to learn about the appropriate cause of something, in this case the house. Following this sort of a question, we can further raise the following queries: “what made these bricks and stones into a house?” and “why do these bricks and stones constitute a house?”. Regarding the former, Aristotle tells us that it is appropriate to mention one kind of cause, what first moves the house as the efficient cause of the overall generation.²⁸¹ Considering the latter, we are acknowledged that it is of another sort. It is not a question of becoming as is the case with the former one but rather it is a question of being.²⁸² Aristotle mentions that in order to answer to the questions of the being of a composite substance, we are in need of explaining thoroughly

²⁷⁸ Ibid., § 1041a9-10.

²⁷⁹ Ibid.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., § 1041a15-20.

²⁸¹ Ibid., § 1041a31-32.

²⁸² Ibid.

the cause of its being as either the form or the essence.²⁸³ As regards some cases such as the house in this example, Aristotle points out the fact that the essence is the final cause or purpose of the thing necessary to define the being. Therefore, it is not misleading to make a conclusion from this example to the point that what provides human beings with house made up of these building materials is the appropriate specification of a house's function as the shelter. To open up quite a bit more this contention, let us examine another example given in *Metaphysics*.

In compliance with the reasoning of Aristotle, it can be declared that unlike the house, a man can be defined as a clear case of a natural substance. From the words of Aristotle:

Since we must have the being of the thing as something given, clearly what is sought is why the matter is something; such as, why are these materials a house? Because the essence of a house is present. And why is this, or this body having this, a man? So that what is sought is the cause of the matter, but this is the form, in relation to which it [the matter] is something. This is the substance.²⁸⁴

Making an allowance for this quotation, please give us permission to assume that the sort of body mentioned at the above citation is a man. On the view that a given individual like Michel is a composite entity analyzable into two components as matter and form, the question of how the form or essence provides a solution to the problem of substantial unity can seem to me to be answered. So long as we accept that a human being is a unified entity over and above the sum of its parts, Michel can be accounted as a single individual comprising an aggregate of organs.²⁸⁵ However, it is deceptive to evaluate being of this single individual, Michel, merely in terms of the sum of his matter representing his body. In other words, the composite substance itself is not a heap of a bodily organs but rather it is a unified whole.

²⁸³ Ibid., § 1041a28 (for *essence*); Ibid., § 1041b6 (for *form*).

²⁸⁴ Ibid., § 1041b4-9.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., § 1041b12-17.

According to Aristotle, the relationship between the substance and what it is composed of can be likened to the relationship between a syllable and the letters composing it.²⁸⁶ As a syllable is not identical to the totality of its letters, the composite substance cannot be unified with the matter that composes it. Aristotle puts an end to the discussion concerning the causation of unity by articulating the following expression that: “But it would seem that this is something and not an element, and it is the cause of being [which makes] this flesh and that a syllable. And similarly in all other cases. This is the substance of each thing (for this is the first cause of being)”.²⁸⁷

In the above cited quotation, the phrase of “substance of each thing” can be comprehended with reference to form or essence although there is no specific indication of either the conception of form or the notion of essence as regards the resolution of the unity problem which is ongoing on the side of substance. This is mostly due to the fact that Aristotle identifies form or essence as the cause of being of an individual substance. Thence, according to my view, it cannot be wide of the mark to conclude that the teleological dimension of the notion of essence comes into sight on the following grounds. To reiterate the line of reasoning once again, please remember initially that we have commenced with the elucidation of the notion of essence as the *per se* predication of substantial entities. Corresponding to this way of justification, it has been found out that *per se* predication bestows an answer to the question of what counts as a definition. From here, we proceed to a discussion concerning the principal causation of substances defined as unified beings. To bring the issue to a close, it has turned out to be the case that essence of a substantial being accomplishes a teleological dimension. This is the case so long as we accept the fact that final and formal causes of a substance are identical under the notion of essence.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., § 1041b25-28.

CHAPTER III:

ON BEHALF OF A CLOSURE DEDUCTION

With the intention of giving a summarizing account on what has been attempted to be discussed throughout this thesis, let us go over the major premises of the thesis project by providing references to the related statements of Hegel in the *PhS*. For Hegel, as is mentioned before, the True is the whole which can be described as not only *Substance* but equally as *Subject*. Furthermore, the true shape in which truth exists can only be the scientific system of such truth. What is more, science is identified with knowledge. Depending upon these statements, Hegel also declares that what he has set for himself throughout the *PhS* is the mission to raise philosophy up into the status of Science.

Only in this way can philosophy put aside the name “love of knowing” as a replacement for “actual knowing”. In order to do this, to establish the way to Science, one must be aware of the fact that the way to Science is itself already Science and hence it is the Science of the experience of consciousness. In this regard, experience of consciousness can be defined in the following way. Natural consciousness as “the Notion of knowledge” passes through a certain path that presses forward to true knowledge. Nonetheless, the length of this path has to be endured since each moment is necessary due to the fact that each is itself a complete individual shape. Besides, natural consciousness as “the Notion of knowledge” needs to have the sufficient patience to pass through these shapes for the sake of attaining knowledge of its own substance. Only thus can consciousness become “the new true object” as “the *recollected-in-itself*” that is the sum of each shape through which consciousness passes. This *dialectical* movement from which consciousness exercises on itself and which affects both its knowledge and its object, is precisely what is called *experience* [Erfahrung].

Concerning the true as the whole, it can be avowed that the whole as nothing other than the essence consummating itself through its development consists in those various shapes

and forms which have become its moments. Before getting into another argumentation, let us recall the relation amidst the concepts of true-knowledge-consciousness as is used in the *PhS*. The true can only emerge through the establishment of Science which is nothing but knowledge. Besides, consciousness is identified with the notion of knowledge. To proceed by depending upon the recently stated lines which are representing in my view the fact that consciousness unfolds itself via the development of truth, the thesis that “the essence necessarily determines both the definition and causal explanation of truth” becomes justifiable. Following this, it needs to be recalled that in this thesis, I have attempted to validate the idea that “Hegel brings final and formal causes of a substance together under his comprehension of the concept of essence and, therefore the argument that he borrows the notion of essence from Aristotle is defensible” by exploring the details of Aristotle’s understanding of the essence. Henceforth, it is now the moment to conclude with the point from where we have started in this thesis. *PhS* can be overviewed as the unfolding of the experience of consciousness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, T., *Hegel: Three Studies*, trans. S. W. Nichol森, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993.
- Andler, C., “Le Fondement du Savoir dans la Phenomenologie de l’esprit de Hegel” in *Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale*, XXXVIII, no.3 (July-Sept., 1931).
- Aristotle, *De Anima: On the Soul*, trans. H. Lawson-Tancred, Harmondsworth, N. Y.: Penguin Books, 1986.
- , *Metaphysics*, trans. H. Lawson-Tancred, London: Penguin Books, 1998.
- , *Physics*, trans. R. Waterfield, Oxford, N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- , *Parts of Animals*, trans. A. L. Peck, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Descartes, R., *Discourse on Method and the Meditations*, trans. F.E. Sutcliff, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968.
- Ferrarin, A., *Hegel and Aristotle*, Cambridge, Oakleigh, N. Y., Madrid, Cape Town: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the History of Philosophy vol. 1-3*, trans. E. S. Haldane, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.
- , *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion together with a Work on the Proofs of the Existence of God vol. 1-3*, trans. Rev. E. B. Speirs and J. Burdon Sanderson, London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1968.
- , *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- , *The Difference between Fichte’s and Schelling’s System of Philosophy*, trans. H. S. Harris and W. Cerf, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977.
- , *Hegel’s Science of Logic*, trans. A. V. Miller, Amherst, N. Y.: Humanity Books, 1969.
- Hyppolite, J., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. S. Cherniak and J. Heckman, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974.
- Kant, I., *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. P. Guyer and A. Wood, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Kojeve, A., *Introduction to the Readings of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. H. N. James, Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1980.

Pinkard, T., *Hegel's Phenomenology: The Sociality of Reason*, Cambridge, N. Y., Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Taylor, C., *Hegel*, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Werner, M., *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit: A Commentary Based on the Preface and Introduction*, trans. P. Heath, Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press: 1975.