

DICTIONARY
OF
PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

INCLUDING
MANY OF THE PRINCIPAL CONCEPTIONS OF ETHICS, LOGIC, AESTHETICS,
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION, MENTAL PATHOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY,
BIOLOGY, NEUROLOGY, PHYSIOLOGY, ECONOMICS, POLITICAL
AND SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, PHILOLOGY, PHYSICAL
SCIENCE, AND EDUCATION

AND GIVING
A TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN, AND ITALIAN

WRITTEN BY MANY HANDS

AND EDITED BY

JAMES MARK BALDWIN

PH.D. (PRINCETON), HON. D.Sc. (OXON.), HON. LL.D. (GLASGOW)
STUART PROFESSOR IN PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

*WITH THE CO-OPERATION AND ASSISTANCE OF AN INTERNATIONAL
BOARD OF CONSULTING EDITORS*

IN THREE VOLUMES
WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND EXTENSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHIES

VOL. I

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

1901

hedonic and hedonics are better than algedonic and algedonics (Marshall). There is a tendency to abbreviate the phrase into 'tone' and 'toned,' as 'tone of sensation' (Baldwin), 'pleasurably toned' (Stout), but that may lead to confusion with affective tone, and should not be done. The objection to the compound term pleasure-pain (Marshall) is that it does not allow the distinction between hedonic tone and the sensations of pleasure and pain, which many psychologists insist upon. See also PAIN AND PLEASURE, and FEELING. In French *élément affectif* is often used, but it fails, as 'affective element' fails in English, to mark the distinction between feeling tone and hedonic tone; and we recommend that it be reserved for the former.

Literature: STOUT, *Analytic Psychol.*, i. 121 f.; MARSHALL, *Pain, Pleasure, and Aesthetics*, chap. i; BALDWIN, *Handb. of Psychol., Senses and Intellect*, 114; *Feeling and Will*, chap. v; and the citations under the terms referred to.

(J.M.B., G.F.S.)

Hedonism: Ger. *Hedonismus*; Fr. *hédonisme*; Ital. *edonismo*. The theory that pleasure is the ultimate standard (or constituent) of moral value. See ETHICAL THEORIES, and EUDAEMONISM.

(W.R.S.)

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. (1770-1831.) Born at Stuttgart, he entered the university at Tübingen as a student of theology, receiving a master's degree in philosophy, 1790. In this same year Schelling entered the university at the age of sixteen, and seems to have stimulated Hegel to greater activity. Hegel had already read Rousseau, and knew something of the Wolfian philosophy. In 1793 he left Tübingen, and became a private tutor in a family at Berne. He wrote a life of Christ, studied Kant and Benjamin Constant, and read for the first time Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre*, which had just appeared. In 1797 he became a tutor at Frankfort, and there read Plato and Sextus Empiricus. In 1801 he removed to Jena, and began lecturing. Closing his lectures at Jena in 1806, on account of the war, he edited a newspaper in Bamberg until 1808, when he took charge of the gymnasium at Nuremberg. In 1816 he became professor of philosophy at Heidelberg. In 1818 he removed to Berlin to take the place left vacant by Fichte's death. Died at Berlin. See the following topics.

Hegelianism or Hegelism. After HEGEL (q.v.). See HEGEL'S TERMINOLOGY (especially II), IDEALISM, EPISTEMOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY, and METAPHYSICS.

Hegel's Terminology (in relation to the Hegelian Philosophy).

I. GENERAL NATURE AND ORIGIN OF HEGEL'S TERMINOLOGY.

Amongst the thinkers who, since Aristotle, have undertaken to work out a relatively independent terminology adequate to the complexity and to the organization of a complete philosophical system, Hegel occupies a very prominent place. His terms are chosen, on the whole, with a very careful regard to his own central theories. They are, in a number of instances, decidedly novel. Where they are familiar terms, their meaning is altered to such a characteristic doctrine of the system, according to which the process, or other object which Hegel names by any term, is the fulfilment, or 'truth,' i. e. the complete expression, of the meaning and purpose of the processes familiarly known under the same name. The method of nomenclature thus indicated is viewed by Hegel himself as justified by general practice; and so far this seems indeed plain, since a familiar source of technical names is the deliberate employment of an already familiar term in a meaning which is not only specialized, but specialized through an emphasis laid upon tendencies or purposes latent in the popular usage. In Hegel's case, however, this fashion of creating his own terminology, by employing familiar terms in new ways, is rendered decidedly more baffling than usual by the twofold fact: (1) that the terms whose sense is thus transformed are already old technical terms, of a past usage no longer vague, but, as Hegel himself holds, rather too abstractly sharp in definition; and (2) that the change from the traditional usage is frequently very considerable, and concerns some of the most original features of the Hegelian system. The result is that brief summaries of the philosophy of Hegel, in his own terminology, are, as this first case illustrates, extremely misleading; and many of the most familiar criticisms of his system as 'panlogism,' as reducing life to 'mere thought,' as recognizing 'no reality but the thinking process,' or as 'identifying the philosophizing intelligence with the absolute,' whatever may be the ultimate justification of these criticisms, actually express, as they occur, mere impressions resulting from such a view of the whole system, obtained without grasping the sense of its terms. In any case it is not at all easy to restate Hegelian defini-

tions, without summarizing the whole of the *Logik*.

As for the sources and development of Hegel's terminology, a considerable proportion of his terms are of course Aristotelian and scholastic in origin, although then usually much influenced by the Kantian usage. A portion are specifically Kantian terms. Another portion are of distinctly independent and German origin. A considerable influence of popular usage appears (in such cases as *aufheben*). Hegel was fond, like Plato and Aristotle, of etymological comments on the supposed origin and meaning of his terms; and in view of the state of the science of language at the time, his etymologies are often decidedly arbitrary. Deliberate plays upon words are also frequent. At the point where we first meet with Hegel's technical vocabulary in any really free expression, viz. in the *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (1807), it appears very fully developed, although not as rich as later in the *Logik*. In the former work, some of the categories (e.g. *Wirklichkeit*, as opposed to *Dasein*, *Sein*, &c.) are not uniformly used in the pregnant sense later obtaining, and a certain number of vaguer or of more poetically formed terms or phrases do not later reappear; while, on the other hand, the relative poverty of the categories of the *Phänomenologie* has been a frequent topic of complaint, especially amongst the Hegelian critics of that work. The *Logik*, in its longer form, was first published 1812-16. In the *Encyclopädie der Philosophischen Wissenschaften* (1st ed. 1817, 2nd ed. 1827), the general statement of the whole system, together with its psychological, ethical, theological, and other terminology, appears.

II. FUNDAMENTAL FEATURES OF THE SYSTEM AS DETERMINING THE TERMINOLOGY.

a. If we now approach a little more closely our task of explaining the main features of Hegelian usage, a few preliminary observations as to the system, viewed as a whole, will help us. To know, with Hegel, as with many other thinkers, is a process involving two factors, namely, the factor usually called experience, and a factor including various constructive processes, of lower or of higher grades. The distinguishing features of Hegel's doctrine depend upon three central theses: (1) that the factor usually called experience, and the other factor (Kant's 'spontaneity' of the thinking process), can never be sundered, but

are universally present, in all grades of knowledge, however low or high; (2) that the lower stages of the knowing process itself are identical in their essential nature with the higher, so that the various grades of knowledge usually distinguished as *perception*, *understanding*, *reflection*, *reason*, &c., are not essentially different mental processes, but are merely successive phases in the evolution of a single process; (3) that the knowing process, in these its phases, in its evolution, and in its entire constitution, not only precisely corresponds to, but is identical with, the essential nature of the world, the object or true being, which is known, so that not only the theory of knowledge cannot be separated from metaphysic, but also the theory of the constitution of the universe is identical with the theory of the process by which we come to know the universe. All these theses are, in a measure, common to the idealism of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel; but Hegel's working out of the theory is in many ways different from that of his idealistic contemporaries. Of these three theses, the first is the one most commonly misunderstood by opponents of the dialectic method (e.g. by Trendelenburg, in the latter's famous criticism in his *Logische Untersuchungen*). It has been supposed by such critics that Hegel deliberately intended to deduce the empirical element in knowledge wholly from the other, or spontaneous, factor of 'pure thought'; and Hegel has been blamed for failing in this essentially hopeless enterprise. But the criticism is founded upon a mistaken interpretation of Hegel's perfectly explicit statement of his position, as will easily appear from what follows.

b. Since knowledge and its object, what Hegel himself ultimately means by thought and by being, are not only thus correlative, but in essence identical, the exposition of the system in the *Logik* naturally proceeds in such a form as to bring this result as clearly as possible to light. Quite apart from the technicalities of the method, its spirit may in general be summarized by saying that, in our philosopher's opinion, all the necessary concepts which lie at the basis of human science, the categories of our thought, can be made rightly to appear as themselves particular stages in the one process whose general character has just been pointed out. The *Logik* itself will be the system of these concepts, with an account of the way in which higher concepts are rationally evolved out of lower ones. Of every one of these concepts it will be true,

according to the general theses of the theory before us, that it is at once a concept of a type or grade of object, and a concept of a stage of knowledge. But not always will this double aspect be easy to seize as we consider any one concept in question. The objective and subjective meanings, as we here might call them, belonging to the various terms, will be always present; but sometimes the stage in the evolution of knowledge represented by the concept in question will be in itself either too objective or too subjective, and sometimes the mere accidents of traditional usage will direct the reader's mind too much to one side or the other of the meaning. Examples of categories that, by virtue of the stage of evolution which they represent, undertake to be categories of fact rather than categories of knowledge, are furnished by such terms as *Sein*, *Dasein*, *Existenz*, *Ding*, *Eigenschaft*, &c. Examples of categories that are explicitly categories of the knowing process, are represented by the terms *Urtheil* and *Schluss*, i. e. *judgment* and *sylogism*. More neutral terms, which in common usage, or at certain stages of the actual history of philosophical discussion, have had both their objective and subjective meanings emphasized, are *das Allgemeine* and *die Idee*. For the Platonic ideas were originally purely objective truths; and the reality of universals has often been discussed. The term *Reflection* is an interesting example of a term which first suggests to the reader's mind the process of subjective reflection, while Hegel frequently emphasizes its objective meaning as a name for a real process. As a fact, so far as the stage in the evolution of the subject-matter at any point permits, all the terms alike are intended to apply *both* to stages of what tradition calls the subjective knowing process, and to grades of what are usually regarded as external objects or processes. Thus Hegel speaks of judgment and syllogism (*Urtheil* and *Schluss*) as objective processes, present in nature or in history, frequently applying the former of these two terms to name processes of differentiation and division (especially those occurring on higher conscious levels), and the latter to name processes of reorganization and of the reconciliation of divided tendencies. This tendency in Hegel's terminology, while its justification, to the author's mind, forms one of the theses of the system, often gives his language, to one who first meets it, a fantastic, or at all events an allegorizing, appearance, which does not

easily pass away, but which in any case must be regarded as a result of the author's deliberate intent, so far as it illustrates the general theses of the unity of *Sein* and *Denken*.

III. THE DIALECTICAL METHOD: GENERAL FEATURES.

a. The method of procedure by which Hegel passes from the lower to the higher stages, in the development of his *Logik*, is of course the most characteristic feature of the entire system. This is the famous dialectical method. Stated still apart from its technical details, it takes two principal forms. The first form especially applies to categories that are defective by being too abstract, and that lay too much stress upon the objective aspect of the truth which they contain. They, in general, are more or less entirely the categories of *Immediacy* (*Unmittelbarkeit*), or, in other words, are categories of the world viewed as fact, or as *datum*. They are, by the general doctrine of the system, imperfect categories. Rightly criticized, they are therefore to lead to higher categories. The process of accomplishing this end is a process of showing that the fact-world is really a world of relations amongst facts, or that its truth is *relative*, so that what a given category attempts to define as *a* alone, or as *b* alone, turns out, upon analysis, to mean *a related to b*. This relation of *a* to *b* also appears to our author's mind as a fact that we grasp only in the transition (*Uebergang*) from *a* to *b*; so that in general we find that, if we first try to hold *a* alone, and then to determine what *a* means, we discover, often to our surprise, and generally with a clear sense of some contradiction thus brought to light, that *a* means *b*, either as one of its own aspects or (especially in the lower and therefore less stable categories) as something opposed to *a* itself, into which *a* nevertheless turns under our very hands, as we endeavour to state its meaning. Hereupon, we observe that the true *a* can be defined only by taking explicit account of *b*, only by transition from one category to the other, and only by the further explicit recognition of the *unity* (*Einheit*) of *a* and *b* in something whose nature appears as one involving the aforesaid *a related to b*. This new unity, made explicit, now gets some name, let us say *c*, and appears as a higher category of the series, which, in general, will have to be treated in the same fashion. The *Einheit*

itself of *a* and *b* does not mean their simple identification; but just as any one space before us involves both right and left directions, or both up and down, and is thus the *unity* of up and down, right and left, without involving the mere confusion of these various directions, so in *c*, *a* and *b* are brought into unity, without our now losing sight of their differences, which the whole procedure has only made more explicit. The contradiction latent in trying to define *a* alone has thus been first brought to light, and then sublated or *aufgehoben*.

b. A simple example of this form of the dialectical method is found at the outset of the *Phänomenologie*, where common sense is challenged to point out some object which is certainly known for what, in our experience, it is. The first answer undertaken by common sense is: *This object*, viz. the object that I here and now see or touch; *This is known to me directly*. Hegel's reply is: But *what is this object?* What does *this* mean? He then points out, in various ways, that the name *this*, *ipso facto*, applies to any object whatever found in experience, so that, instead of reporting its knowledge of a single fact as such, common sense has to define its knowledge, so far, as the most general, vague, and indefinite knowledge possible, a mere knowledge of *thisness* in general, or of a *somewhat here and now*; so that *this*, merely as *this*, means as yet anything, or as good as nothing. The result, so far as it here concerns us, is, that the only knowable objects are much more than merely single facts given as such, viz. as *this*. The known objects of experience involve relations between *this* and *that*, *now* and *then*, *here* and *there*, and are accordingly interrelated masses of differentiated experience—e.g. an object seen against a background, or a thing which is *one* by virtue of and in contrast to its *many* qualities, &c.

The other form of the dialectical method often involves, at the precise point where it occurs, less apparent paradox, largely because we are better prepared for it when its stage is reached. It is, moreover, of a type more generally characteristic of modern idealistic systems, whether Hegelian or not. It is used when our categories have reached some more explicitly subjective stage, when the relativity of our world is already recognized, and when the purpose is to show that the subjective meaning in question is also an objective meaning, or that our more explicitly ideal processes are also expressive of the essence of

absolute facts. Here the method in general consists in showing that the development of the ideal process, and of all the complex interrelationships which this involves, is itself a fact, a law of truth, relatively independent, through its very universality, of the single subjective stages through which it has become explicit, so that, in discovering the inevitable character of a given process of thinking, we have discovered the only truth that, at this stage, there is to know. This truth now becomes once more, in a higher sense, *unmittelbar* or immediate. We now experience its actuality. This form of the dialectical method is used in Hegel's restatement of the ontological proof of God's existence; it appears very notably in the transition from *Subjektivität* to *Objektivität* in the third part of the *Logik*. In general it is used against sceptics, against Kant, against Fichte, and against subjectivism of all sorts. In substance it consists in saying, first, that some point of view, or ideal construction, has now given us a demand, or a fully developed need, for a certain system of conceptions, or of relationships, *a, b, c, d, &c.*; secondly, that the question hereupon arises, whether any objective truth corresponds to this ideal demand; and thirdly, that, carefully considered, the ideal demand, by its very universality and necessity, has shown itself to cover the whole ground which any object could here occupy, so that the fully grown *Begriff* is itself the object sought, the curtain is the picture, and the thought is the being. The basis for this use of the dialectical method is the same as that employed by any idealist who intends to show that the completed meaning of a system of ideas is identical with all that the mind seeks in looking for objective truth.

These two forms of the dialectical method, although developed with great thoroughness and originality by Hegel, are in origin not at all peculiar to himself. The two principles involved, viz. *That facts are knowable only as interrelated*, and *That the universal laws of ideal processes, taken together with the processes which embody these laws, are equivalent to all that is properly to be meant by reality*, are not unfamiliar to students of philosophy, quite apart from Hegel's system. The peculiar relation which Hegel brought to pass between these principles and the logical principles of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle, has led to considerable misunderstanding, and the form of statement

has rendered the system difficult to survey in its wholeness.

Literature: TRENDLENBURG, Ueber die dialektische Methode, in vol. i of Logische Untersuchungen; J. ELLIS MACTAGGART, Studies in the Hegelian Dialectic; GEORGES NOËL, La Logique de Hegel; WALLACE, Prolegomena to Hegel's Logic (2nd ed.), are among the best discussions of the special topic here in question. Trendelenburg's view has been, for Hegel's critics, extremely influential, and is very skilfully stated, despite its defects.

IV. THE MOST GENERAL TERMS OF THE SYSTEM; EXPERIENCE OF THE DIALECTIC PROCESS.

In following the various stages of the dialectical process, one meets with a good many terms which are repeatedly used, not to define any of the individual categories, but to characterize the presuppositions and occurrences which are more or less universal throughout the process. These may here best be taken, first in order, as the *most general* terms of the entire system.

a. The word *unmittelbar*, or *immediate*, as employed by Hegel, is the first of the terms of most general use in the system. This term primarily refers both to the *presence* and to the apparent *lack of relationships* which first seem to characterize objects when taken as sense takes them, or when viewed as a falsely abstract thinking views them. Aristotle's propositions called *ἀμεσά* would be viewed by Hegel as also relatively immediate, but Hegel applies the word to numerous other objects. But *immediate*, in a secondary and higher sense, also refers to a character observable in all truth, even from the highest point of view.

Unmittelbar, in a relative sense of the term, is, for the first, any starting-point, or beginning, or presupposition; *vermittelt*, or *mediated*, on the contrary, is any result or consequence (cf. *Werke*, 2nd ed., iii. *Logik*, 39). In a still more obvious way, however, facts, taken as such, things, mere sensations, first appear to us as *unmittelbar*, and we only gradually discover that they are *vermittelt*, in so far as they stand in *relations*, without which they prove to be meaningless; and so are the *result* of conditions, both subjective and objective, which forbid us to treat them as alone. Numerous special shadings are given to the meaning of these two terms, *unmittelbar* and *vermittelt*, by the subject-matter and the con-

text; but these meanings are all derived from the general meanings:—*unrelated* and *related*; *given* and *explained*; *elementary* and *developed*; *initial* and *resultant*. In matters of practical import, *unmittelbar* can often be translated by *unwon* or *unearned*. Thus the object of a given vague plan appears as merely *unmittelbar*, when we have as yet no idea of the means by which to win it; the possession of unearned powers involves an immediacy to which we have as yet no explicit right, &c.

b. The universal law, principle, or process of *Vermittelung*, or of the whole evolution, both of thought and of things, is termed *Negativität*. This term, one of the most difficult in Hegel's usage, suggests in one word the entire system.

Negativität is a principle both of destruction and of production. That which *Negativität* produces, on the positive and objective side of its work, is first precisely the world that at the outset the philosopher empirically finds as the realm of immediacy, the whole universe of experience. Upon its destructive and subjective side, *Negativität*, as the principle determining the process of knowledge, next appears as denying or sublating the appearance of *mere* immediacy which characterizes this world, and so as both destroying abstractions and reducing the world of fact to a realm of universal relativity. *Negativität* finally, as the 'negation of the negation,' appears, in a new constructive task, as the process whereby the rational unity of thought, and of things of immediacy and mediation, of experience and reason, comes to light, in the positive system of the philosopher. In consequence, *Negativität* explicitly names a law or process both of things and of knowledge. This law, again, on its objective side, is the principle that everything merely immediate is false, transient, and illusory, but that the very constitution and evolution of the real world, as a whole, depends upon this very fact. In the process of displaying this transiency of every finite fact, in the conflicts due to the resulting contradictions, and in the bringing to light of the illusions, the very life and actuality of the whole outer or objective universe consists. Even the positive construction of the objective empirical world by the principle of *Negativität* is consequently full of relatively destructive processes. The visible universal is thus the incorporation of the principle called *Negativität*, which, as Hegel sometimes says, might be called *die Seele der Welt*.

The absolute possesses *Negativität* as its

own principle or law. If one takes the absolute abstractly, views it apart from the world in which it expresses itself (as the philosophical mystics love abstractly to view the absolute), or in a similar manner regards any principle as if it could be isolated from its manifestations, the absolute, or the principle in question, then possesses what Hegel calls *reine oder sich auf sich beziehende Negativität*, 'pure or self-related, or self-centred, Negativity.' This implies that such absolute, taken thus in abstracto, would be a *self-denying* essence, a *sich auf sich beziehende Negativität*, or an idea which was self-related only in this negative way (cf. *Logik*, 2nd part, *Werke*, iv. 17, 31).

c. Any unity, i.e. any whole meaning or object, which exemplifies in a particular case the principle of negativity, by combining within itself differentiated, opposed, but related contents, is frequently called a *negative Einheit* (see *Logik*, 2nd part, *Werke*, iv. 42). So the unity of consciousness is a notable case of *negative Einheit*.

The exercise of *Negativität*, or an act which exemplifies it, especially in its first or more destructive aspect, but also, on occasion, in its constructive aspect, is an act for which Hegel uses the verb *aufheben*. Of this word he gives a full account in *Logik, Werke*, iii. 104. *Aufheben* and *vermitteln*, he here tells us, are very largely synonymous. In popular language *aufheben* is already ambiguous, since it means both to destroy and to lay aside for keeping. Hegel is attracted by this double sense, which seems to him an instance of unconscious speculative thought. He accordingly gives the verb its technical usage.

V. FURTHER GENERAL TERMINOLOGY. THE STAGES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF 'VERMITTLUNG.'

We now come to a series of generally applied expressions, for the various degrees in which any object, or category, may manifest either a relatively pure immediacy, or some form of explicit mediation. These expressions are the characteristic phrases and epithets: *Abstrakt, Concret, an sich, an sich oder für uns, an ihm or an ihm selbst, für sich, an und für sich, gesetzt, bestimmt*; together with various abstract nouns, such as *Ansichsein, Fürsichsein, Bestimmung, Bestimmtheit, Beschaffenheit*, which, while having a place amongst the categories, are principally useful as charac-

terizing the stages in the development of other categories.

a. *Abstrakt* and *Concret* have, in Hegel, an opposition not identical with the more familiar technical usage. With him an individual object may be so taken as to make appear *abstract*, while any universal principle becomes concrete just in proportion as it becomes true. Hegel's use of *abstrakt* includes, however, most of the ordinary applications, and is more extensive. Any object is *abstract*, in so far as it is viewed in a false isolation from its genuine relations, or if it is something in the world of objective things and processes, when it appears as a fact apart. In the objective sense, Robinson Crusoe alone on the island would be a relatively abstract individual, because he could not live a whole human life; when the man Friday came, Crusoe and his life were already more concrete, for man lives in relation to his kind. *Abstrakt* differs from *unmittelbar*, in so far as the former more easily applies to the cases which ordinary usage also calls *abstract*, viz. to cases where a relation is abstracted from its terms, a principle from its applications, &c. But it is true, of course, that *reine Unmittelbarkeit* is in Hegel's sense an abstraction. However, *unmittelbar* connotes *presence*, while *abstrakt* primarily refers only to isolation. *Concret*, on the other hand, is any whole, especially when its organization is explicit. 'The unity of various contents is the concrete' (*Gesch. d. Philos., Werke*, xiii. 37, Einl. — a passage in which the concept of the concrete is very fully developed and illustrated). Philosophy, therefore, instead of being confined to abstractions, really deals, according to our philosopher, with the most concrete object, namely, the organic unity called the world or the absolute.

The expressions next on our foregoing list, *an sich* and its correlatives, form a closely connected and very characteristic phraseology, which recurs in our philosopher's discussion of categories of every grade.

b. If deliberately dwelt upon in its *Unmittelbarkeit*, any object is viewed *an sich*. It is so viewed especially when one returns to such immediate view by a deliberate ignoring of other objects. But thus viewed it is not only falsely viewed, but is a basis for truer views, an abstraction out of which the more concrete form of these truer views develops. In this way *an sich* comes to mean *latent, undeveloped, not overt*, as one can speak of the infant Shakespeare as already, or *an sich*, a born

poet. For even in dwelling upon the infant as infant, one necessarily interprets the infant in terms of what is to come. For the same reason, *an sich* may become wholly equivalent, in some contexts, to the scholastic *in potentia*. In case of mental processes, *an sich* may mean *unconscious*, as the man who hates his brother is *an sich* a murderer (or a murderer *in his heart*), although he perhaps does not recognize how murderous his hate is. This sense of *unconscious* is frequent in the *Phänomenologie*. All these meanings have both objective and subjective applications. The Kantian sense of *an sich*, according to which *an sich* means *independent of consciousness*, is often enough used in citations from Kant, and in criticisms of that philosopher, and is by Hegel connected with the notion of abstract (and secondary) immediacy, which according to Hegel belongs to objects, precisely in so far as they are conceived to be independent either of consciousness or of other things. *An sich* in all its meanings differs from *unmittelbar*, mainly by its greater intensity, viz. by virtue of the still more deliberate ignoring of relations which is in mind when an object is taken, not merely *as it comes*, but with express effort to sunder it from other objects, and to view it by itself; or again, when an object appears in the world in such wise as thus to lay stress upon the absence, or the complete latency, of its relations. *Das Unmittelbare*, in its first or lower forms, has as yet no relations; but what is *an sich* tries, as it were, to disown them (*Logik, Werke*, iii. 119: 'In so far as anything is in itself, it is withdrawn from relation to other, and from otherness').

c. The peculiarly Hegelian phrase *an ihm*, equivalent according to the author to *AN sich*, with an emphasis laid upon the *AN* (loc. cit., 120), is most naturally to be used either in the form, '*Etwas hat an ihm* any given character,' or also in the form, '*Es ist an ihm*, namely, *an etwas*, this same character.' Hegel justifies the usage so far by appeal to such popular phrases as, *Es ist nichts daran*. Hegel, however, in a sufficiently barbarous fashion, is capable of saying *dass das Etwas das, was es an sich ist, auch an ihm ist* (loc. cit., 123), so that *an ihm* becomes a predicative phrase, which is not easily intelligible apart from the technical explanation. This explanation is that *an ihm* refers to a character which is, in a more external and overt fashion, so in a subject, or rather, as one might say, attached to this subject, as to determine the

subject's relations to others. If a man's latent traits of character, never yet expressed in his conduct, were supposed to be revealed by his features, a physiognomist would say that what the man in *himself* (*an sich*) is, is also *an ihm*, that is, belongs to him as feature, or is *in him* after all (Stirling, *Secret of Hegel*, new edition of 1898, 399, renders the force of *an ihm* as 'the manifestable peculiar nature' of its object). In brief, then, while the *an sich* of any being is a name for characters which are, if possible, to be dwelt upon by ignoring this being's relations to others, and while the *an sich* is therefore a name for abstract, fundamental, but latent and barely potential features, *an ihm* refers to characters that seem externally attributed to the being in question, so that they are more manifest, and are more such characters as indicate relations. A name for the characters which a being, as a consequence of its *an sich*, or original and latent nature, has *an ihm*, is the *Bestimmung*, or *vocation*, *destiny*, *power*, *capacity*, of a being, its *fitness* for external relationships (*Logik*, loc. cit., 123). This term is translated by Stirling (op. cit., 259) as *qualification*, and is interpreted by the same author (op. cit., 399) as 'that to which the something (*Etwas*) is adequate.' *Bestimmung* is opposed to *Bestimmtheit* by Hegel (loc. cit.) as capacity to the particular state, the definite condition or activity embodying this capacity. If the *Bestimmung* is fulfilled, one has a *Bestimmtheit* proper, the relation between the two being much that of *first act* and *second act* in scholastic terminology. Thus the *Bestimmung des Menschen*, the *vocation* or *capacity* of man, is to be reasonable, or is Reason (so Hegel himself, loc. cit.); but his thinking activity, his *Denken*, the fulfilment of this capacity, is his *Bestimmtheit*.

d. In general, any being is *bestimmt*, in so far as its determinate features bring it into contrast with external beings. *Bestimmen* is the verb which expresses the process of adding the specific differences, or *differentiae*, to the more general characters of anything. *Bestimmtheit* involves, when externally viewed, a *Beschaffenheit* (by Stirling ingeniously rendered *talification*), whereby a thing appears like this or that when involved in chance relations to other things. The *Beschaffenheit* is thus nearly allied to Aristotle's *accident*, as in the well-known Aristotelian example: 'You are not cultivated in so far as you are you (i. e. in yourself), but in so far

as this has occurred to you.' So the *Beschaffenheit* reveals the *Bestimmung*, but in more accidental and external ways.

e. A being is *für sich* in a sense still more advanced. When characters no longer latent have been so developed, when relationships no longer ignored have become so explicitly included in the definition of a being, that it now appears capable of a genuine independence, as an internally related whole of meaning, it is taken *für sich* when this independence is insisted upon, or when, in the objective world, such independence appears to assert itself. An atom, a Leibnizian monad, or a Kantian autonomous moral subject, undertakes to be *für sich*. *Fürsichsein* is therefore such *independent being* as, for some definite reason, appears to include a system of internal relations, and to cut off external relations (cf. *Encyk.*, *Werke*, vi. 189; *Logik*, *Werke*, iii. 165).

A being is *an und für sich* in so far as its asserted independence is altogether the developed result of its nature, so that what it is *in itself* fully justifies its asserted independence of external relations. This stage is also called *Beisichsein*, and the compound *An-und-fürsichsein* is also employed (*Encyk.*, *Werke*, vi. 161; *Logik*, *Werke*, iv. 5). *An-und-fürsichsein* belongs, in the highest sense only, to the absolute, but is often attributed to the later categories and to conscious beings of higher grades.

f. As to the terms *gesetzt* and *Gesetzsein*, it must be observed that any character is *gesetzt* in so far as it is *explicitly* shown to result from the nature of the object to which it is referred. *Gesetzsein* means the condition or state of being thus *gesetzt*. Thus the born poet, or poet *an sich*, who shows himself in youth to have the *Bestimmung* of a poet, or to have poetry *in him* (*an ihm*), or to bear the marks of a poet *about* him (still *an ihm*), is not yet *gesetzt* as a poet until by original production he has *lived up to* his early promise. *Gesetzt* is directly translated as *posited*. Stirling points out (op. cit., 368) how numerous are the consequences of this central conception of *Gesetzsein*. 'It is *gesetzt*,' says Stirling, 'means, it is developed into its proper explication, statement, expression, enunciation, exhibition, &c. Again, a *Gesetztes*, as not self-referent, is but lunar, satellitic, parasitic, secondary, derivative.' Still other derived senses appear in Stirling's view, in various passages; but these can usually be made clear from the context.

A final observation must here be made, in closing this series of terms, as to the interesting and frequent expression, *An sich oder für uns*. As Hegel is extremely anxious to distinguish, in the progress of the dialectical method, between what is so far explicit (*gesetzt*) and what is thus far only *latent* or *potential* in the development of any conception, he frequently has occasion to insist that a given feature, asserted to belong to any object, is not yet the explicit result of presuppositions, or is not yet *vermittelt*, but appears as a fact whose potentialities we, the philosophizing readers, predict in advance, or observe, while they are yet, in the object itself, only latent. What is latent thus becomes the same as what we externally observe to be in the object; and therefore what is *an sich* is so far just *for us*, or is observable from our point of view.

VI. OTHER TERMS.

a. Very characteristic of this system is the series of grades of being, or of gradations of the existential predicate. These are: *Sein*, *Dasein* (including *Realität*), *Existenz*, *Wirklichkeit*, *Substantialität*, and *Objektivität*. To say of a given object merely, *Es ist*, is not, for Hegel, as pregnant an assertion as to say, *Es existirt*. Still more do you say if you assert, *Es ist wirklich*. The most pregnant assertion on the list would be, *Es hat Objektivität*. An object may possess *Sein* without having *Existenz*. When Hegel asserts, in a well-known passage, *Alles Vernünftige ist wirklich, und alles Wirkliche ist vernünftig*, he does not mean that whatever *exists* is rational, for it is a part of Hegel's thesis that much of the merely phenomenal, but still existent, world contains chance, i. e. irrational contingency, while only the notion is *actual* or *wirklich*. Hegel's ontological phraseology must therefore be carefully considered in interpreting his meaning. This, to be sure, is less true of the *Phänomenologie* than of Hegel's later works, since in the *Phänomenologie* the ontological vocabulary is less clearly differentiated. In particular our terms mean as follows:—

Sein is the name for pure immediacy as such. Everything and anything *is*—the vaguest fancy or dream, in so far as it possesses immediacy. But pure immediacy taken absolutely in itself, as merely itself, without definitions and contrasts, would be the same as nothing. Hence the actual cases of immediacy all possess *Dasein*, or determinate being, i. e. being that has some sort of

Bestimmtheit, or contrast with other beings. *Dasein* would be possessed, so far, by any object with characters, e. g. a house, or any part of the universe, viewed merely as distinguishable part, but also by a rainbow, a flash of lightning, a taste or smell, or any *Etwas*. But such an *Etwas* is primarily *bestimmt*, its *Dasein* involves its determination. Only the *precisely* determinable, then, is present in the world of *Dasein*. If one says that he experiences *something*, we naturally ask, *What?* If there is no answer naming the determinations of the *Etwas* in question, we have to say that it is *nothing in particular*, and this indefiniteness, if complete, would send us back to *reines Sein*, which is again equal to *Nichts*. But now, as Spinoza affirmed, *omnis determinatio est negatio*, and so determination, or *Bestimmtheit*, implies contrast with, and so negation of, some other determinate character, and every *Etwas* is opposed to *ein Anderes*, its negation or other (as light is contrasted with darkness, &c.). Such contrast, as a universal feature of *Dasein*, includes the twofold character that every *Etwas* is *positive*, in so far as it is what it is, and *negative*, in so far as it excludes the other. The *positive* character, whereby light, for instance, is light, as opposed to the *negative* character, whereby light is not darkness, Hegel calls the *Realität* of any *Etwas*, as opposed to its *Negation*. So that the term *Realität* is used, in the sense of the Kantian table of categories (see KANT'S TERMINOLOGY), to mean the positive aspect of the *Bestimmtheit* or *differentia* of any determinate being whatever (cf. *Encyk., Werke*, vi. 180; *Logik, Werke*, iii. 109 ff.). The difference between this usage and either the scholastic usage or the senses of *reality* more common in recent discussion must be noted.

b. Existenz, as opposed to *Sein, Dasein*, and *Realität*, is a much higher category, and, although it expresses a later form of immediacy, belongs to the world of *Wesen*, i. e. of explicitly mediated or relative being, to the world of principles and of phenomenal expressions of principles. The typical case of *Existenz* is any physical *thing*, with *qualities*. This has a grade of being, not merely involving, like *Dasein*, or like colours and rainbows, contrasts with other beings of the same grade, but pointing back to explanations, through principles, of the *basis (Grund)* upon which the thing's existence depends, or which it manifests, even in its immediacy. What has *Existenz* is also in interaction with its environment.

Wirklichkeit is a still higher category. What has *Existenz* is a relatively immediate fact, but appears as the result of conditions, and as related to an environment. But what has *Wirklichkeit* not only has a basis, or is explicitly the expression of a principle, but contains this basis within itself, so that it is relatively (in the complete case wholly) independent of any environment. It is, then, a higher instance both of *Fürsichsein* and of *An-und-fürsichsein*. If a physical thing with qualities has *Existenz*, an organism, a commonwealth, a solar system, or any such relative *totality (Totalität)*, possesses *Wirklichkeit*. In the most genuine sense, only the absolute would be *wirklich*, but the term is often employed for finite but relatively organic beings (*Logik, Werke*, iv. 113, 115 ff., 120, 176 f., 178; *Encyk., Werke*, iv. 250, 253, 282 ff.; and cf. the introd. to the *Encyk.*, iv. 10).

The type of *Wirklichkeit* historically represented by Spinoza's substance possesses, for Hegel, the grade of being which he names *Substantialität*, namely, *Wirklichkeit* conceived as a fully developed necessary nature of things.

c. Objektivität is the grade of being possessed by an object which explicitly fulfils or expresses a system of rational ideas, thoughts, or laws that is also subjectively conceived. This category differs from *Wirklichkeit* chiefly by virtue of the more explicit prior sundering of the ideal aspect of the world from its immediate aspect. To say that a thing is *wirklich* implies, indeed, that it expresses what can be defined as a law or rational character; but one may first accept the *Wirklichkeit* as an immediate fact, and then observe its constitution, as a student of politics first regards the state as an actuality, and then analyses its structure. But when one affirms *Objektivität*, one does so *after* defining laws, subjective principles, systems of rational interrelationships, which already have their inner or *a priori* validity and necessity.

When one asserts of these systems that they also possess the immediacy exemplified, on lower stages, by *Dasein, Existenz, &c.*, then, and not till then, is one dealing with the grade of being defined as *Objektivität*. The systems of things subject to law or expressive of purpose, which we find in nature and in history, possess therefore not only *Wirklichkeit*, but also *Objektivität*; as, for instance, one may say: 'Purpose is an objective fact in the

universe' (*Encyk., Werke*, vi. 365 ff.; *Logik, Werke*, v. 167 ff.).

Objektivität is possessed, in its own highest grade, by the completely fulfilled or expressed *Wahrheit*, or *truth*, which Hegel calls the *Idee*, or, in other words, by the *life* or *self* of the universe, the concrete embodiment of the principle of *Negativität*, also technically called the *Subject-Object*. The *Idee* is at once a name for the absolute, and for the world-process, taken in all its stages, but here viewed as a logical category (*Logik, Werke*, v. 229 ff.).

d. In contrast to the terms for the categories of immediacy stand the terms for the processes and results of mediation or of the process of thought. The term *Gedanken* is often used by Hegel to name what are by ordinary usage called *thoughts*, namely, *abstract thoughts*—the ordinary *concepts*. In this narrower sense, however, *Gedanken* are but fragments of the true *Denken*; and it is the purpose of the philosopher to lead such mere *Gedanken* to the unity of the *Begriff*. For the general definition of *Gedanke*, as subjective and individual occurrence, see *Encyk., Werke*, vii. 2, 355; the frequent narrower use is exemplified in the *Vorrede* to the *Phänomenologie, Werke*, ii. 7, 24 f.

The term *Begriff* itself has been variously translated; but Stirling's choice of *notion*, accepted also by Wallace, has now, on the whole, possession of the field. A good deal could be said in favour of the term *meaning*, as a translation of *Begriff*, were it possible to fix this essentially fluent popular term to any technical usage. The very fluency of the term *meaning* would tend to suggest Hegel's conception of what the *Begriff* is to accomplish, and its neutral reference *either* to objective or to subjective meaning, and *either* to volitional end or to intellectual significance, would be in conformity with the purpose of Hegel.

The term *Begriff* is, to the process of active mediation called *Denken*, precisely what the term *Sein* is to the contents and processes of the world of immediacy in the first division of the *Logik*. *Begriff*, namely, is: (1) a general name for any of the individual or relatively separable processes and products of *Denken*, and here especially for the earlier stages of *Denken*; (2) a name for the principle, law, or living meaning which expresses itself in the whole evolution of *Denken*; (3) a collective, or better, here, an organic name for the whole course of the evolution itself, conceived as an objective world of rational fact.

In sense (1) we can speak of various *Begriffe*, e. g. of the *Begriffe* of individuality, of the universal, of the syllogism; or, again, we can speak of all the previous categories of *Sein* and *Wesen* as, on their subjective side, *Begriffe*. So far *Begriff* is then a class name.

In sense (2), which is the most important of the three, and which one may call the first concrete sense, the term *Begriff* has *both* an objective and a subjective application. It names (a) the principle which, just because it is that of *Denken*, is the real principle which governs the whole universe, and which expresses itself therein; and this use of the term is very frequent in Hegel's terminology, not only here, but in other works than the *Logik*. Or (b) it names the philosophical process of subjectively appreciating the nature and meaning of this principle. This subjective use of the term *Begriff* is, on the whole, predominant in the *Phänomenologie*, and is never abandoned. It appears in the *Logik*, and Hegel himself uses the terminology *subjektiver und objektiver Begriff*.

Sense (3) appears in the title to this division, and is very easily derived from sense (2). It is the second concrete sense in which *Begriff* is used.

As for the further nature of this principle (the *Begriff*) itself, we now know it, in general, from the account already given of *Negativität*; only that term is explicitly an abstract noun. But *Begriff*, when employed with objective reference in sense (2), is generally—apart from special meanings, almost always—employed to name *concrete embodiments of the principle*, or the *principle as concretely embodied*. *Negativität* therefore stands to *Begriff* very much in the relation in which, in scholastic terminology, *Deitas* stands to *Deus*. *Negativität* is the *Qualität* of the *Begriff*. Sense (3) above enables us, also in concrete fashion, to speak of the whole world as the *Begriff*.

The *Begriff* (in senses 2, 3), as Hegel often declares (e. g. *Logik, Werke*, v. 12), is Spinoza's *Substanz* 'set free,' or turned into a *subject*. In this same sense, taken with objective reference, one can speak of the *Begriff* in the terms above used in speaking of the *Idee*; only that in the *Idee*, as the final form of the *Begriff* itself, the aspect of immediacy has fully returned to this principle of the universal mediation of thought and of things, by virtue of the discussion of the categories of *Objektivität*. In any case, what

was first expressed as *Sein*, and then as *Wesen*, is now to be fulfilled as *Begriff*. That alone can be real which is of the nature of the life, principle, or meaning that determines the whole process of *Denken*. So much, then, for the terms *Denken*, *Gedanke*, and *Begriff*.

e. The way in which *Negativität* appears as the character of the *Begriff* is next notable. The *Begriff*, as the principle which determines both thought and things, is to be not only a self-related and self-differentiating process, but a process whose differentiations have exactly the type observable in *self-consciousness* of all grades. Self-consciousness, as Hegel is never weary of telling us, is a unity, at first *immediate* or *abstract*. This unity, however, preserves itself just by exercising itself in overcoming, and reducing to the service of its own desire, or will, or conception, or insight, countless facts that at first view are foreign to its own nature. It thus involves mediation, with constant rewinning of immediacy. That is how any man lives, whether materially or spiritually. The logical account of the *Begriff* will have therefore first to state the universal dynamics of this self-conscious process in the most universal form. Hegel here calls the *first*, or *immediate*, aspect of the *Begriff*, its *abstract* universality (*abstrakte Allgemeinheit*). Its mediation through variety of life, will, experience, meanings, finite individuals, &c., he calls in general its *Sich-Bestimmung* or its *Besonderheit*, its *particularity*. The developed *Begriff*, in differentiating itself into a variety of *Bestimmungen*, which, while held *within* the developing universal, may still in their immediacy seem at first foreign to its one meaning, 'comes to itself' precisely so far as, with *concrete Allgemeinheit* (or concrete universality), it recognizes these particulars as within itself, and as even in their immediacy still its own *meaning*. The finite facts of the life of the *Begriff*, the individuals of finite experience, the various *Existenzen*, &c., are thus within the *concrete universal* of the whole life of the true *Begriff*. The three terms, universal, particular, and singular (or individual), like the original terms *unmittelbar* and *vermittelt*, may frequently change places in their application; but throughout their discussion the main conception remains, as just stated, constant. The process present is the one originally called *Negativität*, but now it is present as a *conscious* process. It is a process of asserting unity through self-differentiation, and through bringing the results again into organic rela-

tions. The outcome of the process is a unity, essentially the unity of Self-Consciousness, wherein all finite individuality is present within a union (*Einheit*) of *Allgemeinheit* and *Besonderheit* ('The one undivided soul of many a soul' of Shelley's familiar phrase). Hegel, in general, defines this union as the category of *Einzelheit*, or *individuality*, the category, one might say, of the unity of the many in the one.

These three, the categories of the *Begriff*, viz. *Allgemeinheit*, *Besonderheit*, and *Einzelheit*, are to be understood, like the rest of the discussion, with reference to the special nature of Hegel's own *Begriff*. They are then not the merely tradition conceptions known under these names. In the later developments of this division of the Logic, the *concrete universal* becomes explicitly identical with an *infinite individual* (in Hegel's technical sense of infinite as developed above in (7), viz. a completely self-determined individual).

f. The particular mediations of the *Begriff*, in its primary or more subjective forms, occur through the development of the doctrines of *Urtheil* and *Schluss*. These, the principal sections of the traditional Logic, are incorporated by Hegel into his own theory in a greatly altered form, and with a deliberate effort to give them an interpretation which may also be stated as an objective process. An *Urtheil* is a process of making differentiation and the opposition of related terms explicit. No judgment, therefore, is subjectively expressive of a whole truth, and no corresponding objective process is a final one. Every judgment is one-sided, is a particular expression of *Negativität*, and passes away into some higher form of judgment, or into that truer expression of the *Begriff*, the *Schluss*. In particular, judgment depends upon opposing finite individuals, particulars and universals, in various degrees of abstraction, one to another, and then endeavouring to hold their unity also abstractly before the mind, despite the opposition. The higher forms of judgment express more nearly the organic union of finite individuals or particulars in inclusive universal wholes; but no judgment can reach the final unity, and the truth of the judgment is the *Schluss*. The *Schluss* is, as subjective process, an effort to express the uniting principle or *Mitte* (*middle term*), namely, the very selfhood of truth itself, which binds the many particulars of a differentiated experience in the unity of a single conscious whole. The objective correspondent of the subjective pro-

cess called *Schluss* is any expression of an organically unifying principle in the realm of truth itself. The categories of *Schluss*, precisely as the necessity of such union becomes manifest, tend themselves to assume a more one-sidedly objective character, and the truth of the *Schluss* is the realm of *Objektivität* already considered (see above, (7))—a realm where objects are known as expressing rationality in its wholeness. When these objects are once more reflectively regarded as objects due to ideal demands, and so not merely as corresponding to *Denken*, but produced by it, the circle of this form of idealism is completed in the *Idee*. The *Idee* itself, in its freest manifestation as *absolute Idee*, is the highest possible logical definition of Hegel's Absolute itself. (J.R.)

GLOSSARY.

(The numbers and letters refer to the sections and paragraphs of this article.)

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Absolute Idee, VI. f. | Gesetzsein, V. f. |
| Abstrakt, V. a. | Grund, VI. b. |
| Abstrakte Allgemeinheit, VI. e. | Idee, II. b, VI. c. |
| Allgemein, II. b. | Logik, II. b. |
| An etwas, V. c. | Mitte, VI. f. |
| An ihm, V. c. | Negation, VI. a. |
| An sich, V. b. | Negativität, IV. b, VI. c. |
| An sich oder für uns, V. f. | Nichts, VI. a. |
| An und für sich, V. e. | Objektivität, III. b, VI. c. |
| An-und-fürsichsein, V. c. | Realität, VI. a. |
| Aufheben, I, III. a, IV. a. | Reflection, II. b. |
| Begriff, III, VI. d. | Reines Sein, VI. a. |
| Beisichsein, V. e. | Reine Unmittelbarkeit, V. a. |
| Beschaffenheit, V. d. | Sein, I, II. b, VI. a. |
| Besonderheit, VI. e. | Schluss, II. b, VI. f. |
| Bestimmt, V. d. | Setzen, V. f. |
| Bestimmtheit, V. c, d, VI. a. | Sich-Bestimmung, VI. e. |
| Bestimmung, V. c. | Subjekt-Objekt, VI. c. |
| Concret, V. a. | Subjektiver und objektiver Begriff, VI. d. |
| Concrete Allgemeinheit, VI. e. | Subjektivität, III. b. |
| Dasein, I, II. b, VI. a. | Substantialität, VI. b. |
| Denken, II. b, VI. d. | Totalität, VI. b. |
| Ding, II. b. | Uebergang, III. a. |
| Eigenschaft, II. b. | Unmittelbar, III. b, IV. a, V. |
| Einheit, III. a, IV. c. | Unmittelbarkeit, III. a. |
| Einzelheit, VI. e. | Urtheil, II. b, VI. f. |
| Es existirt, VI. a. | Vermitteln, IV. a, c, V. |
| Es hat Objektivität, VI. a. | Vermittelung, IV. b. |
| Es ist, VI. a. | Vernünftig, VI. a. |
| Es ist wirklich, VI. a. | Wahrheit, VI. c. |
| Etwas, VI. a. | Wesen, VI. b. |
| Existenz, II. b, VI. b. | Wirklich, VI. a. |
| Für sich, V. e. | Wirklichkeit, I, VI. b. |
| Fürsichsein, V. e. | |
| Gedanke, VI. d. | |
| Gesetzt, V. f. | |

Heliotropism: see TROPISM.

Hell [AS. *helan*, to hide]: Ger. *Hölle*; Fr. *enfer*; Ital. *inferno*. The place where lost sinners abide, suffering endless punishment, and keeping company with the devil and with devils.

Like many other words which have gathered an import that is the result of the associations of centuries, the term hell is commonly used without any very exact conception of its meaning; it is taken symbolically. To gain further information, one turns naturally to the Scriptures. There, the word hell, with all its mediæval materialistic associations, has been used to translate no less than three widely different terms. These are:—(1) The Hebrew *Sheol*, with its Greek equivalent *HADES* (q.v.); for this, hell in its modern significance is no fair translation. (2) The Greek *Tárapos*, for which, once more, hell is no proper equivalent, *Tárapos* being the place to which rebel immortals have been consigned, or where the corrupt are pent up for ever. (3) The Greek *Gehenna* (*Γέννα*), the place where the impenitent suffer the penalties they have brought upon themselves. *Gehenna* is associated with the 'Valley of the children of Hinnom,' a place connected traditionally with defilement, foulness, and corruption. For this term hell furnishes a fair enough equivalent, because there can be little doubt that, in the centuries preceding Jesus, this valley came to be associated in popular Jewish usage with the place where irrevocable vengeance overtook the wicked.

The clause in the Apostles' Creed—'He descended into hell'—must be taken in connection with this subject. It is probably a late addition to this symbol; and, having little Scripture warrant, it has been interpreted very variously. The Greek Church teaches that the human soul of Christ descended into hell to preach the gospel for the redemption of those who were there on account of original sin. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that the God-Man made the descent in order to release the 'saints of Israel.' The Lutherans hold that the God-Man descended on the morning of the Resurrection only (the interval since death having been passed in Paradise), and for the purpose of pronouncing sentence on sin. The Reformed theologians regarded the expression as wholly figurative, and as indicating the sufferings which Christ endured through the crucifixion. In other words, the phrase merely empha-