detached, as it were, from the knowing subject, and gain through this greater independence and objectivity.—Plants, to begin with, are without any knowledge. They do not react at all (in the sense in which we have used the word) upon external affection. In them the receiving of impressions and the being determined by them completely coincide, in which essentially the nature of irritation consists (§ 20,9). In the brutes these two elements are sundered. Thus the brute reacts upon external impressions, but only so far as is necessary to distinguish itself from external objects, that is, to establish between itself and the objects of the outside world (and partly even between the different objects themselves) the spatial, temporal, and causal connection springing from the forms of the intellect (§ 80). However, the brute intellect is still wholly absorbed in things, and animals are therefore at every moment totally dependent on surrounding impressions. From the brute to man nature takes in this direction the last possible step by augmenting the reactive faculty of the intellect to such a degree, that things appear completely isolated from the knowing ego and therefore in full objectivity. The result on the subjective side is the passing of consciousness into self-consciousness, while on the objective side it becomes possible to the intellect, by means of its isolation, to dissolve perceptions into their elements, that is, their characteristics, and to
grasp and retain these in new combinations as concepts, wherein the whole mechanism of Reason consists.

§ 116. It is therefore essentially one and the same reactive faculty which, developing by degrees, establishes as the immediate application of the Understanding the connection between the affections of the subject and the external world, as the mediate application of the Understanding the connection between external objects themselves, and as the faculty of Judgment the connection between the perceptual world and its predicates, classified as concepts. The faculty of judgment is the tie which unites concepts with each other and finally with perception. It is reflecting, when extracting the general from the particular; subsuming, when ranging the particular under the general. If we take away from Reason the faculty of judgment, there remains to us only Memory, the function of which is, to reproduce in part perceptual, but chiefly abstract representations. On this account the brutes possess it only to a very limited degree, because they lack abstract representations and with these the possibility of a connected remembrance.

Remark.—Memory is, strictly speaking, not so much a faculty of retaining representations once had, as rather a facility for reproducing these by means of “association of
ideas," which (like a gymnastic exercise) becomes the easier, the oftener it is practised. For the rest Memory is not, like Understanding and Judgment, that which makes intellectual superiority, being rather antagonistic to it. Only the fact that education, instead of cultivating before all things the Understanding and the Judgment, burdens the memory, can explain the circumstance, that the minds which on an average are most gifted by nature, and on the cultivation of which most pains have been bestowed, that is, those of scholars, have by no means always the intellectual ascendancy to which they otherwise might have claim.

XXIII. Retrospective View of the Human Mind in General

§ 117. The intellect is, as we have shown, nothing but a component part of the animal organism and accordingly, like all members of the body, an organ of the Will (of which later). It is not, therefore, metaphysical and immortal like the soul, that is, the Will, but physical and perishable, like the body. This is the less to be regretted, since it is the constitution of our intellect which bars our view into the inner being of things. Nay, the sinfulness of our earthly life is intimately connected with the existence of our intellect, since it is intellect which by its forms creates plurality on which all egoism and discord depend.

Remark.—Yet the world created by the intellect is only the visibility of sin, while the real root of sin lies still
deeper (in the freedom of the Will), and remains, therefore, inaccessible to our intellectual apprehension. But this can only be fully understood later on.

§ 118. The human intellect is, as we saw, an organ of perfect unity with two functions: (1) that of producing representations, on which depend the immediate application of the Understanding, the mediate application of the Understanding, and the faculty of judgment; (2) that of reproducing representations, wherein consists the nature of memory and imagination. The latter differs from memory chiefly by the fact, that its images arise without the consciousness of reproduction, and show therefore no connection in time, space, and causality with the present. On this depends the value of imagination in works of art and its unfitness for use in practical life.

Remark I.—It may be that of these two chief intellectual functions the productive is dependent on the quality of the brain (fineness of texture, proper nourishment, etc.) and the reproductive on its quantity (in comparison with the nervous matter of the whole body).

Remark II.—It is interesting to compare our division of the intellect with a very similar one of the buddhi in the Nyāya- and Vaiśeṣika-Philosophy (see for instance Bhāṣā-pariccheda, v. 50. 51).

XXIV. Man and Brute

§ 119. Inner and outer perception are common to us with the brutes. Now these two are the only sources from which we obtain all our knowledge.
We have accordingly, as regards the content of our knowledge, no advantage, over the brutes, and our whole superiority to these is due to the fact that we can give our perceptual knowledge another form, namely the abstract form of concepts.

§ 120. At first sight this difference may seem to be a slight one. It is, however, the result of a qualitative and quantitative development of the brain which is probably the most difficult work accomplished by nature. None of the innumerable species of animals even distantly approach it, no being known to us has surpassed it. If now it is the faculty of concepts, that is Reason alone, which raises man above the brute, all that distinguishes human life from that of the lower animals and stamps it with so distinctive a character, must be derived from Reason.

§ 121. Animals are restricted to perceptual knowledge. This embraces (apart from single recollections) nothing more than the immediate present. For its connection with what is absent, past, or future is only representable by means of concepts, which the brute lacks. It lives, therefore, only in the present, which, like a mighty stream, sweeps unceasingly past it, leaving but a few perceptual images impressed on its memory. Hence the limitation of its horizon.
§ 122. Not so Man. Continually is he occupied in grasping what is essential in the fleeting present, by storing it in concepts which comprehend under a few categories the immeasurable variety of the perceptual world. Thus we have in concepts, instead of the fragmentary perceptual recollection of the brute, a connected consciousness of the past, even though the amount of perceptions we retain in them is but limited. By means of concepts we control, besides the narrow circle of the perceptual present, the immeasurable totality of the absent and reckon with it in all our thinking and acting. Through concepts we anticipate nine-tenths of the future. It but seldom happens that the capricious course of things does not confirm the calculations we have made beforehand in abstract concepts.

§ 123. Thus is opened to our view the whole of the world, the reproduction of which in a system of methodically arranged concepts is the aim of all Empirical Science. At the same time we become aware of the sorrowful and fleeting nature of our existence. Death, which is unknown to the brute until the moment of dying, stands before our eyes as an ever-threatening necessity, and the fear of possible suffering torments us more than actual distress. Both drive us to Philosophy; it is, according to the Indian view, the remedy for all the ills of existence; it is, as Plato says, a preparing for death (Phaedon, p. 64 A).
§ 124. Again, the planned action of one or of several individuals in co-operation is only possible through the faculty of concepts. On it depends all that serves to protect and adorn our existence: art and science, education, government, justice, law, agriculture, industry, commerce—in short, whatever we oppose to nature as civilisation, and by which human life presents such a striking contrast to that of the brutes. All these great institutions are unknown to the brute, and its intellect, confined, as it is, to the present and unaware of the greatest wants and dangers of the future, would not suffice to guarantee the safety of its existence, if all wise Nature had not provided a means, where knowledge is insufficient, for guiding the steps of the brute without knowledge as though it were with knowledge. This provision of Nature is instinct, one of the most important facts for philosophy, with which we shall have to deal later.

§ 125. The action of brutes is throughout determined by perceptual motives confined to the present: hence the transparency of all that they do. Man, on the contrary, has not only perceptual but also abstract motives, which allow him a deliberate choice, since, before he acts, he can reflect, that is, allow the different motives to try their power on his will, in order to experience which of them is the strongest. For by the strongest motive his action is
in every case determined, and his decisions are never free, though the determining motives may often not be apparent to us. The acting according to abstract motives is called reasonable, and in it lies a great prerogative of Man: for his power increases in proportion as he is able to free himself from present impressions and be guided by the consideration of the totality of things (present to him in abstract representations). The moral worth of a character, however, depends on what sort of motives influence the will, and not on the form, whether concrete or abstract, which they adopt to determine our actions.

XXV. On the Nature and Origin of Language

§ 126. Concepts, as modifications of the substance of the brain, are not perceptible. In order to be communicated, they need certain external symbols. These are the words of language, peculiar to man alone. The relation between concept and word cannot be an accidental one; and yet it is not a thoroughly necessary one, as appears from the diversity of primitive languages.

§ 127. The sounds of language had to express two things: firstly, concepts and, secondly, the relation of concepts to each other. Hence the necessity for two elements of speech: signs of signification
and signs of relation. In all languages these two must appear either separated or united as words. In the latter case the union is either a merely external one and causes no change in the signs, or it is internal, so that the two elements mutually influence each other (whether by strengthening of the root or weakening of the termination). Hence we have three possible stages of speech, which include all known languages.

1. The isolating languages (ex. Chinese) range signs of signification and signs of relation (as far as the latter are not entirely suppressed) together, without any union.

2. The agglutinative languages (ex. Finno-Tartaric, Polynesian, and the majority of languages) combine both elements without altering either.

3. The inflectional languages (Semitic and Indo-Germanic) make of the two elements an organic whole in which one modifies the other. This proves, perhaps, that man at this stage of language first attained the intellectual energy to grasp the concept and its relation as a unity.

§ 128. Just as comparative anatomy regards the higher organisms of the animal kingdom as a more perfect development of the lower, so the anatomy of the primitive languages leads to the assumption that the inflectional languages were originally agglutinative, and these again isolating. The supposition is
obvious that these three stages of language correspond to three stages in the growth of the thinking faculty. We may leave undecided, how far the isolation of the concept-sign and the relational sign to which modern languages have in part returned, bears witness to a deterioration of thought.

§ 129. But suppose we had reduced all languages to that stage in which all concepts were expressed by isolated monosyllabic roots, the chief problem would still remain unsolved; for how came men to choose for a particular concept just these sounds and no others? The theory, that the denotation of concepts by sounds was due to convention (ἡσυγεί), falls to the ground, for all convention is only possible by means of language. Moreover concept and word have certainly grown one with the other, as the skin grows together with the body and is not drawn over it afterwards.

§ 130. The following theory (together with onomatopoeia and other subordinate influences) might lead to a satisfactory explanation of the origin of speech; whilst the diversity of the primitive languages might be attributed partly to original physiological race-differences, partly to the deeply-moulding influences of climate, soil, occupation, food, etc. Imagine man in the condition of the brute, restricted to perception and like the brutes absorbed, as it
were, in it. By degrees the reactive faculty of the intellect increased (§ 115.4), the apprehension of the surrounding present became more and more objective, and the subject opposed itself more and more determinedly to external objects. This awakening of man was expressed through his denoting his relation to the outside world by gestures (of the hand, foot, eye, etc.). Herewith the animal state was passed, for no animal attains to a real gesture language. Now in the same way as to-day the (untrained) deaf and dumb accompany the gestures with which they make themselves understood, by more or less articulate sounds, so it might happen that the desiring, refusing, pointing at, grasping, seeking, etc. which were manifested through that primitive speech of the limbs, were at the same time accompanied by a corresponding movement of the organs of the mouth. Thus, for instance, the pointing with the hand might be accompanied by a pointing of the tongue, which however was not visible, but as ta (the demonstrative pronoun) became audible and so perceptible even in the dark. Little by little perhaps these gestures of the throat, tongue, and lips would take the place of the analogous gestures of the limbs which formerly they had accompanied. In this way exchanging visibility for audibility, they were able, even in the absence of the object to be denoted by them, to refer to it. Thus on the one hand the mind became independent of the corresponding present, while by the
same process on the other hand the perceived object passed into its fancy image and—by restricting the reproduction to the essential outlines of the object—into its concept.

§ 131. The process and the further development of language to its highest perfection belongs entirely to the sphere of conscious Will, and yet it cannot be admitted that languages are the product of conscious design. For it is impossible that the childlike consciousness which meets us in the hymns of the Rigveda, should have created a language—the analysis of which demanded all the penetration of a Pāṇini. Language therefore belongs to the unconscious creations of the Will within the sphere of consciousness, that is, to the productions of instinct, and we must explain the high perfection of primitive speech in the same way as we do the geometrically-woven web of the spider and the wonderfully-ordered communities of the bees and ants.
§ 132. "What is the World?" This is the simple fundamental question of all philosophy. The immediate answer would be: "Well, the world is nothing but the world. It lies extended before your eyes, and moreover all empirical sciences are engaged in investigating more and more minutely every part of the universe."—Those who do not acquiesce in this answer are called philosophers. Even after all the instruction of empirical science, they cannot get rid of the tormenting question: "But this so much investigated and well-known world—what is it in its real essence?"—Their continued asking shows that they distinguish the What of the world from the world itself, that they regard the world as the appearance of an essence which in itself does not appear, and which no progress in empirical science can ever reach.
§ 133. It is this real essence of the world which philosophy has sought since the most ancient times as the principle from which the existence of the world with all that it contains, may be derived and explained. The character therefore of every philosophical system is determined by the two questions: (1) what principle of the world it establishes, and (2) how from this principle it explains the world. Almost all pre-Kantian philosophers erred mainly in this, that (as is already indicated by the name ἀρχή, principium) they transferred the forms of our understanding, space, time, and causality to the principle of the world, and further used these forms as a bridge to go back from the world to its principle. Kant, however, proved that it is just by means of these innate functions of our Understanding, that the principle of the world, which he called the thing-in-itself (Ding-an-sich), is presented to our eyes as the universe extended in space, time, and causality. Hence we must neither transfer these forms of knowledge to the thing-in-itself, nor abuse them, to derive from it the world which is its appearance.

§ 134. The impossibility of establishing a spatial, temporal, or causal connection between phenomena and the thing-in-itself becomes evident to us even in an empirical way, if we try, by means of facts and with the help of bold hypotheses, to picture to ourselves the life of the Universe as it exists in
infinite space through infinite time. However far we may go by the clue of causality backwards, forwards, and on all sides in space and time, we reach only what is in nature, but never that which (to speak figuratively) lies behind it, that is, we are always restricted to Physics without ever being able to penetrate to Metaphysics.

Remark.—In contradistinction to Physics or the science of Nature, the science of Being-in-itself (des An-sich-seienden) is happily expressed by the name Metaphysics, though (like the beautiful name Vedânta) we probably owe it to a mere literary accident.

§ 135. The natural sciences show us the world as a totality of matter which perpetually changes its qualities, forms, and conditions (§ 14). Now all these changes in matter and also (as we showed, §§ 74-76, 86-88) material objects themselves are finally only a sum of effects; and these effects are one and all nothing but the varied manifestations in space, time, and causality of that which in itself does not exist in space, time, and causality, and is therefore absolutely unknowable. It is this unknowable essence which scientists call force, and which in a series of original phenomenal forms (the physical, chemical, and organic forces of nature) is manifested in all those effects, constituting nature. In so far as these effects concern our body and thereby make us conscious of the existence of
things, they have been mentioned already under the name of sensations or affections (§§ 43, 69, 75).

§ 136. The scientist or student of nature can accordingly only indicate how, that is, in what form of space, in what sequence of time and under what causal conditions force is manifested; but he does not know what force in itself may be, because it exists neither in space nor time, nor is it to be found by means of causality (§ 24). From this it becomes clear that the same entity which philosophers seek as the principle of the world, is that which is presupposed by Kant as the thing-in-itself, and by natural science as force, and by both given up as unknowable.

§ 137. Philosophy meanwhile is engaged in explaining the world from this principle, this force, this thing-in-itself (§ 133). Now all explanation is the deriving of the unknown from the known and not the reverse. If therefore the problem of philosophy is not absolutely insoluble, there must be some point from which the thing-in-itself is not only accessible, but even more immediately and more intimately known than the whole phenomenal world which is to be explained from it.

There is such a point, and there is but one.
§ 138. All knowledge is a process in our intellect. The latter is for ever bound to the forms which constitute its nature (§ 694). Now it is in these forms that the thing-in-itself appears expanded, as the world. Consequently, so long as we perceive things through our intellect, that is, so long as we are human beings, a knowledge of the thing-in-itself is impossible to us.—So argued Kant. He believed to have thereby overthrown Metaphysics for ever.

§ 139. Kant's conclusions would hold good for all time, if our intellect and its three forms were the only way to reach things.—But this is not so. More intimately known to me indeed, than this whole world, is the intellect in and through which all its manifestations are presented to me; but there is one thing still more intimately known to me than my intellect, and that is I myself. In our own inmost self therefore, if anywhere, must lie the key which opens to us the inner understanding of nature. Here it was found by Schopenhauer.—No sculptor's chisel, no poet's hymn can worthily celebrate him for it.

§ 140. Plato deplored that our intellect, in which he placed the centre of the soul, should be bound to body which dims the purity of our perception of things (Phaedon, pp. 66 B. 79 C). 'But we must
rather praise this dispensation, since our body is the only thing which we apprehend, not merely, like everything else, from without, but also from within. Before, however, guided by Schopenhauer, we make use of inner experience to open to us the understanding of the external world, let us cast a glance at nature, as it would appear to us, if we were, as Plato wished, pure bodiless intelligences, that is, if external experience alone and not internal as well were at our command.

II. Nature, viewed from the Standpoint of Pure Intellect, that is, from without

§ 141. The a priori forms of our intellect: time, space, and causality, are perfectly familiar and comprehensible to us. The a posteriori force, given as sense-affection, which we weave with these forms into the totality of nature (§§ 45. 75), remains entirely unknown and inconceivable. Hence follows, that the intelligibility of nature reaches just so far as the a-priority in it, and that the phenomena of the inorganic and organic world become gradually more mysterious and incomprehensible in proportion as a-posteriority prevails in them.

§ 142. All that the investigator of nature can determine, is the manifestation of force in a certain place, at a certain time, and as the result of a certain
cause. In this alone lies the comprehensible part of phenomena. Accordingly what we understand is the spatial form and the temporal sequence of phenomena, but not what appears in this form and this sequence. Likewise the causality of phenomena, that is, their being conditioned, is comprehensible, but not that which, occasioned by cause, appears as effect; and one can follow, step by step, how the comprehensibility of natural phenomena decreases in proportion as, in the scale of mechanical, physical, chemical, and organic phenomena, the effect gradually overwhels the cause, in becoming, in comparison to it, more and more dissimilar, mighty and independent; which is due to a gradually increasing susceptibility or, so to say, sensibility of organic and inorganic beings. While namely the force, embodied in all nature from the stone to man, becomes more and more susceptible to the causal influence, which thereby turns from cause in its narrower sense into irritation, from irritation to perceptual and finally to abstract motives (§§ 20. 115.), the causes become ever more heterogeneous, insignificant, and remote in comparison to the effects which they produce, and for this reason the comprehensibility of the effect, consisting in its causality, becomes slighter and slighter.

§ 143. Among all sciences geometry, arithmetic, phononomy, and logic are alone absolutely clear,
because they lie entirely in the *a priori* domain. But already even in mechanics an obscuring element makes itself felt in the *a posteriori* given force; although the mechanical action of forces, due to the preponderance of a-priority in it, has for us the greatest possible comprehensibility. Hence our natural inclination to interpret every effect as a mechanical one. Less comprehensible to us than pressure and impact are the phenomena forming the subject of physics and chemistry, because in these we see the effect becoming more and more unlike its cause, and are therefore unable to understand how, for instance, expansion should be caused by heat, electricity by friction, or chemical decomposition by light. Yet the susceptibility of force to causal influence remains slight in all inorganic nature. Here therefore with the degree of the cause that of the effect increases and decreases, and the change in the cause is as great as that which it imparts to the effect (§ 201).

§ 144. Neither of these two laws holds good, once we pass from the inorganic to the organic world. The susceptibility of things to causal influences, manifested even in inanimate nature, appears in an intensified form in the life of plants and animals, and for this reason effect and cause become more and more foreign to each other. Effect here shows itself in the phenomena of life;—cause, for the
involuntary changes in plant and animal life, in irritation; for the voluntary movements of animals, in motives. Already in the case of irritation increase of cause may lead to a contrary effect, and changes in the effect take place without corresponding changes in the cause, whereby even the phenomenon of life gains such a mysterious independence. Yet, in the case of irritation, the action is always conditioned by contact in space and a certain duration in time; also the receiving of the impression and the being determined by it still completely coincide.

§ 145. In the voluntary movements of animals these two are sundered; the cause appears here as motive, the effect as bodily movement. The medium between the two is the intellect. The latter is at bottom nothing else but that same susceptibility to the causal influence, inherent in everything that exists, which appears here, in conscious beings, in an intensified form as a specific organ, namely, the brain. In proportion as the intellect becomes perfected in the animal scale, the gap between cause (motive) and effect (movement of the limbs) becomes ever wider, and with that the incomprehensibility of the causal influence ever greater. This incomprehensibility reaches its highest degree in the action of Man, since this is determined not only by perceptual but also by abstract motives
(§ 125). Here the effect is even no longer confined, as in the case of the animal, to the presence of the cause; the thread between cause and effect has become so thin, that many have even ventured to deny its existence and to declare the action of man as (empirically) free, that is, as conditioned by no cause whatever.

The external comprehensibility of natural phenomena, which consists in the transparency of the nexus between cause and effect, has here at the highest stage completely vanished, and consequently the manifold and ever-changing movements of our own limbs would be for us the darkest point in all nature—were they not of all the most clear, because, by a particular chance, the philosophising intellect itself forms here a link in the secret chain, and is thus initiated into the mystery of Nature at the very point where it appears in its highest development.

Remark.—To the increasing incomprehensibility of natural phenomena corresponds, in a practical respect, an increasing difficulty in the management of them; for every influence is possible only by way of causality, and that, as has been shown, becomes obscurer, the higher we ascend in nature. Hence inorganic bodies are more easily managed than plants, these than animals, and animals than men. Compare from this point of view the increasing difficulty in the task of the mechanic, the chemist, the gardener, the physician, and the teacher.
III. The Way into the Interior of Nature

§ 146. We have shown how the viewing of things from without, whether by the subjective method of Kant or the objective method of empirical science, leads finally to an inscrutable entity (the thing-in-itself, affection, force), which is for ever unattainable by way of external experience. For wherever we may turn to grasp the thing-in-itself,—there stand ever between it and ourselves, as a darkening medium, the innate forms of our intellect, showing us how it appears in time, space, and causality, but not what it is in itself.

§ 147. All things in the world are accessible to me only from without,—with one exception. This exception is my own self (ātman), which I am able to comprehend firstly, like everything else, from without, and secondly, unlike anything else, from within. In both cases that which comprehends, is the intellect, woven of time, space, and causality, that which is comprehended, the sensation, given to the intellect as nerve-irritation. Thus far internal and external experience are similar. But the great difference between the two is this. On the one hand I know my ego as an object of external experience, like every other thing, by construing in space, with the help of causality, the affections
given to the external senses, through which process my Self, just like everything else, appears in my perception as a through and through material body. Now, on the other hand, I do not conceive the affections coming from within, like those from without, as effects which I project as causes in space and time. On the contrary, my ego, as object of inner experience, is free from space and causality, and there remains only the form of time in which expanded inner experience is reflected in the intellect. Thus time is the only barrier which hinders me from knowing by the inner view, what I am as thing-in-itself. The question is, whether it may not be surmounted.

Remark.—The outer world and the inner world both lie as feelings in our consciousness and are both for the intellectual ego something foreign, something else, a non-ego. And yet we treat them both differently. For we consider the external impressions, given by the senses, as aliens and expel them from us by means of causality. The internal or subjective feelings of volition, pleasure, and pain on the contrary receive from us the rights of citizenship and remain, as belonging to our ego, untransformed. This is explicable only by the fact, that the intellectual ego is not the final point of unity in ourselves, but recognises above itself another and a still higher ego, from which these internal sensations spring. We are about to disclose this higher ego in us as the willing ego.

§ 148. When I move any limb of my body (ex. hand or foot), this process, regarded from without, appears as a bodily change in space, time,
and causality; regarded from within, as a volition, that is, as Will, expanded in time. We distinguish here three things: the bodily movement, the volition accompanying it, and the Will manifested in it. But these three are not different in themselves but only so for our intellect, because their difference springs only from a different relation to our intellect. (1) Bodily movement lies always in time, space, and causality. (2) The volition, corresponding to it, does not lie in space; it lies in causality, so far as every volition is determined by a motive, and again it does not lie in causality, in so far as I do not conceive inner like outer affection (§ 75) as an effect, which I refer to its external cause. Finally, every volition fills a certain time and consequently appears certainly and necessarily in the form of time. (3) Will itself, however, which appears to the external senses as bodily movement and to the internal sense as the single acts of volition, lies neither in space, nor in causality, nor in time. It lies therefore beyond the reach of our intellect and remains thus in itself absolutely unknowable. We know it only in so far as it is mirrored in the intellectual form of time, in which it appears extended as volition.

§ 149. That which appears to our intellect as bodily movement, is in itself Will. But just as not only the changes in matter, but also material
objects themselves are nothing but sensation which we construe as bodies in space, time, and causality, so also, as will appear in the following, not only the movements of my limbs, but also the limbs themselves of which my body is composed, are intrinsically and in themselves Will. The understanding of this truth is somewhat difficult, because in a normal state I am little or not at all conscious of my body. I become conscious of it however, the moment some outward influence affects it, which inwardly makes itself directly felt as sensation. This sensation is (with the exception of normal sense-affections) either pleasure or pain, that is, a willing or a non-willing imposed on us by the corresponding impression. From this it appears, that not only the movement of the body, but also the body itself, as far as I am at all conscious of it, enters into my consciousness as Will.

Remark.—Let it be said here once for all, that by Will we do not mean, as one might expect, the acquired sovereignty of the reason over the claims of desire, nor mere intentions, resolutions, or decisions, which are nothing but calculations of motives concluded in the intellect and provisionally and revocably approved by the Will. But Will here and throughout is for us that which is better known to us than anything else and therefore inexplicable by anything else, that which indeed underlies all inner emotions, all desiring, striving, wishing, longing, craving, hoping, loving, rejoicing, grieving, etc., but of which we first become fully conscious in performing externally any movement of our limbs, or in experiencing any influence on our body (hunger, thirst, pleasure, pain, etc.).
IV. Conscious and Unconscious Will

§ 150. All changes by which the life of my organism is sustained, are either voluntary (animal, conscious) and result from motives, or involuntary (vegetative, unconscious) and produced by irritation. The first are all, as we saw, manifestations of Will. The question is, whether we must assume for those involuntary functions which serve for the nutrition of the body, a different principle from Will, or if in both cases it is the phenomenal form alone that varies, while that which appears in it remains the same.

§ 151. The following reasons lead us to the highly important conclusion, that it is one and the same force which appears, on the one hand in the voluntary movements of the limbs, on the other, in the involuntary vital processes of digestion, circulation of the blood, breathing, etc.

1. The fundamental character of every natural force is the striving to take possession of matter, by driving back or subduing those other forces, which till then had the mastery of it. Hence arises that hostile behaviour towards each other of natural forces striving for manifestation by reason of which nature everywhere and always presents the spectacle of a struggle of opposing forces. Also in the service of our organism a whole series of physical and
chemical forces are continually active. But all these are, in a state of health, kept down and governed by a higher central force which manifests itself in the unity of the whole notwithstanding the diversity of the parts, in the unity of the aims notwithstanding the variety of the efforts. For the unity of these aims we see voluntary and involuntary vital functions co-operating in perfect harmony. They are not, therefore, like the physical and chemical agencies in their service, the manifestations of opposed forces, held temporarily in reluctant subjection, but it can be only one force which manifests itself in both in different ways.

2. As in the whole, so in all its parts this unity of conscious and unconscious life is apparent. Thus, for instance, the use of the hand belongs to the voluntary manifestations of life, but its form is the work of those involuntary functions to which the nutrition of the body is due, together with its formation, renewal, and healing. Now the function of the hand is predetermined in its whole structure. Therefore that which uses the hand, cannot be only accidentally related to that which forms and nourishes it. This would, however, be the case, if the forming power and the employing power were fundamentally different.

3. Every organic movement, whether voluntary or involuntary, is, physiologically speaking, the contraction of a particular muscle. No muscle can
contract without being irritated by the nerves ending in it. This nerve-irritation springs, in the case of the muscles of voluntary movement, from the cerebral system, in that of the muscles of involuntary movement, from the sympathetic system. Now that which is essential in every movement, is the effect, appearing as contraction of the muscle; that which is accidental (and therefore capable of being replaced by other influences, for instance, by electricity), consists in the conditioning cause, appearing as nerve-irritation. Accordingly voluntary and involuntary movements differ not in what is essential but in what is accidental, not in the effect but in the kind of causation which provokes it. We must therefore conceive them as manifestations of one and the same force which appears in two different forms.

Remark.—It is of great importance to understand, that the difference between the voluntary and involuntary functions appears so considerable only to us, that is, to our knowing intellect, because in the case of voluntary movements the intellect by chance forms itself a link in the chain irritating the muscles (§ 84), while it is absolutely excluded from any participation in the involuntary movements. But in itself it is only a secondary and unimportant difference, that the nerves, stimulating the muscles to contraction, should take their way in the one case through the brain, in the other through the ganglia.

§ 152. It is therefore one and the same force.
which is manifested through two diverse but harmoniously co-operating phenomenal forms in the voluntary and involuntary processes of life. It is this force which has been called by physiology and psychology (in their best moments) vital force and soul respectively. Yet these two names signify as much as $x$ and $y$, that is, a something perfectly unknown, and therefore do not further our understanding. Now this force, as far as it appears in voluntary, that is, conscious movements, is not only known to us, but even better known than anything else in the world, under the name of Will. Again we have shown that the being accompanied by consciousness concerns only the causality of will-phenomena, that is, what is accidental and belonging only to the forms in which Will appears, and that, apart from the kind of causation, it is one and the same force which produces on the one hand, by means of motives, the conscious and voluntary phenomena of life, and on the other by irritation the unconscious and involuntary. Accordingly philosophy here makes use of its right to give to the popular significations of words the sense, resulting from a more accurate conception of nature, and so requires that we accustom ourselves to recognise Will even there where it is not, as in voluntary movements, accompanied by consciousness. We call that, therefore, which operates in the vegetative functions of the organism, the unconscious Will.
§ 153. Thus that of which I become aware (in that part of the phenomena of life alone accessible to inner experience) in each movement of my body (§ 148), in each sensation of pleasure and pain (§ 149) as Will, even this entity, more familiar to me than anything else, it is which, without the aid of intellect, accomplishes as unconscious Will, namely as unknowing impulse, blind instinct, determined by irritation, all the involuntary processes in my organism; on which processes depend through digestion, circulation of the blood, breathing, secretion, etc. not only the nutrition, but also the whole growth and development of the body. From that, therefore, which immediately enters into our consciousness as Will, we need only deduct the share of the intellect, to retain that which, as the inner impelling principle of our whole life, not only perpetually sustains, by the assimilation of new and the elimination of waste materials, the integrity of our body, heals its wounds, combats foreign forces intruding as diseases, and (if not overcome by these in death) subdues them, but which also produces all growth of the body from birth and its original formation before birth, after it has burst into existence (in generation) with that impetuosity, characterising the manifestation of all forces of nature. Thus every man is, in the deepest sense, his own work: for each is through and through the objectivity of his own Will, which, originally and essentially unconscious, accomplishes as sexual im-
pulse, generation; as plasticity, formation in the womb and growth after birth; which in unconscious wisdom—unattainable by any consciousness—shapes from the beginning all organs of the body in conformity to its original aims; and amongst these, as a regulator of its relations to the external world, the brain, that is, the intellect, through which at last it emerges, in the full light of knowledge, as that which it essentially and originally is, namely as Will.

V. On the Soul and its Relation to the Body

§ 154. The human organism with all its different parts and functions forms throughout a perfect unity. Yet men have always distinguished two elements in it: firstly, the material body, given as an object of external experience; secondly, the immaterial soul, accessible only to the inly-directed consciousness. In remarkable coincidence, explicable only by the fundamental tendencies of human nature, we see in Indian, Greek, and modern philosophy the error arise, that the soul is essentially and in the first place a knowing being, whereas on the contrary all facts of psychic life unmistakably prove, that the centre of man is to be sought not in the head, but in the heart, not in knowing, but in willing. To this in particular the following facts bear witness:

1. The intellect develops, like all organs of the
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body, in childhood, and decays with these in old age, as is well and truly described by Lucretius (III, 445-458). Will alone in man does not age; for as already the Mahābhāratam (xiii, 367) has it:

jitṛyante jitṛataḥ kecyā, dantā jitṛyanti jītṛataḥ, cakṣuḥ-grotre ca jītṛete, trishṇā eka na tu jītṛate;

"Of him who grows old, the hair grows old, The teeth grow old of him who grows old, The eyes grow old, the ears grow old, Desire alone does not grow old."

2. The intellect suspends its activity periodically in sleep, the Will, as unconscious Will, is, like the heart, unwearying.

3. The intellect is, like all organs of the body, an instrument of the Will, as the submissive servant of which it throughout appears, while the dominant factor is the Will; a truth which, if not perhaps apparent in the study, is seen everywhere in practical life.

4. Descending in the animal scale, we see the intellect more and more diminishing, while Will, as we shall show, animates everywhere with the same vehemence even the lowest animal.

5. Excellences and defects of intellect are not taken into account at all, when it is a question of determining the real, that is the moral worth of Man.
But to the deeds of a man, and to them alone, as manifestations of the quality of his Will, we attribute a significance reaching beyond the tomb.

Thus is shown everywhere, that what is primary and radical in man, is the Will, while all that is connected with the intellect, belongs only to the physical and perishable form in which our Self (ātman) appears, but not to the metaphysical and eternal substratum of it, that is, the soul.

§ 155. So long as we place the essence of the soul in intelligence, we shall, notwithstanding all the proofs for immortality adduced by a Platónic Phaedon, be ever driven back by consideration of the facts to the conclusion of the candid Lucrētius (III, 462):

\[ quae participem leti quoque convenit esse; \]

for nothing is more certain than the annihilation of the intellect by death. Only when we resolve to break with tradition, and, in accordance with the facts of inner consciousness, to place the essence of the soul not in the intellect, but in the originally and essentially unconscious Will, shall we succeed in establishing, in spite of all attacks of materialism, the immortality of the soul; and that not by artificial and easily misleading arguments, but as a simple and inevitable conclusion, drawn from the tenets of Kantian philosophy here set forth by us.
§ 156. Like everything else in nature, I myself am on the one hand phenomenon and on the other thing-in-itself. As phenomenon, viewed through the forms of my intellect, my being appears as body, which, like all that exists, is through and through material. Now the same entity which, viewed externally, appears as the body, moving in time, space, and causality, when viewed from within, apart from space and causality, enters my consciousness as volition, or, when I strip off the form of time, as Will. We have shown that Will is the principle not only of the voluntary movements, but also of the involuntary nutritive functions, on which the nourishment, growth, and origin, and consequently the whole existence of the body, depend. Accordingly my body is nothing but Will itself, objectified in space and time through causality, and all its members, hand, foot, brain, stomach, genitals, etc. are the objectity of the various tendencies of Will.

§ 157. Hence follows, that that which as thing-in-itself, and so independent of time, space, and causality, is my soul, that is, my Will, appears in phenomenal form as my body, extended in space, existing in time, and subject in all its manifestations to causality. Now all becoming and perishing, all being born and dying is possible only in time by causality. Consequently as body I had a beginning and shall have an end, as Soul, that is as
Will, I am on the contrary uncreated and immortal.

Τῶς γένεσις μὲν ἀπέσβεσται καὶ ἄπιστος ὀλεθρός.

§ 158. My organism appears as a variety of material parts which co-operate for the maintenance of the whole harmoniously and in conformity to its original aims. This unity in plurality remains for empirical science an absolutely inconceivable miracle. Even the conception of the body after the analogy of human works of art, as the planned work of an all-wise Creator, does not explain the facts. For apart from its being objectionable on moral grounds, this extremely bold hypothesis would only suffice to explain a mechanism but not an organism. The solution of the riddle from our standpoint is extremely simple. The Will as thing-in-itself is a perfect unity. Our body is just this undivided Will, as it appears viewed through the forms of our intellect. These cannot make any change in its essence, and therefore the phenomenon, though appearing extended in space as body, and in time as life, shows the same unity which it possesses as thing-in-itself or Will.

VI. The Will in Nature

§ 159. My own ego alone is accessible to me in two ways: firstly, from without as representation,
that is as body; secondly, from within as Will, that is as soul. All the rest of nature is given me from one side only, namely as representation. The question is, whether it is merely this, and consequently a phantom without reality, an empty semblance, an illusive apparition, or whether, being externally like myself appearance, it may be also internally the same as I am, namely Will.

§ 160. No one will seriously doubt that all human beings, like himself, are inwardly conscious of themselves as willing, and that consequently their bodies, like his own, are objectifications of Will, even though no actual proof of this can be adduced, since all proof leads from one point of the represented world to another, but never beyond representation in which alone the external world is given to me. But we meet here a case where analogy is more convincing than any proof could be.

§ 161. After admitting that all men, just like ourselves, are objectifications of the Will, we shall find it impossible to deny the same in the case of the brutes. For what distinguishes man from the brute, is the organisation of the intellect (§§ 119-125). Now intellect belongs to the form of appearing, but not to that which appears through this form (§§ 154, 155). Consequently Being-in-itself (das An-sich-Seiende) in man and brute is the same, thus here as there, Will.
§ 162. Diverse as are the different animal species as regards their external appearance, they are yet identical as regards that which they will. All animals, from the highest to the lowest, are embodiments of the Will to life, which in all stages strives equally to conserve itself. Hence all exertions of the brute are concentrated in the two tendencies, to preserve the individual by nourishment and protection, and the species by propagation and care of the young. This is the everywhere identical problem. The consideration of how it has been solved by nature in the endless variety of animal species, ever differently and yet ever in like perfection, forms an inexhaustible source of entertainment. From this point of view zoology gains an interest which no other could give it.

§ 163. The Will as the objectification of which every man and every animal appears, is originally and essentially unconscious. It is only in a limited sphere of animal life, becoming narrower as we descend the scale, that it furnishes itself with consciousness. Nothing proves more clearly the secondary and so to say borrowed nature of all conscious life, than the necessity of sleep. In sleep, owing to the isolation of the brain from the motor and sensory nerves, consciousness is periodically extinguished, that is, the union between will and intellect is suspended, and the latter, for the sake
of its (that is the brain's) nourishment, is merged completely in unconscious life, which, as the central and essential entity, unconsciously exercises its functions, whether we sleep or wake. This is already taught by a passage of the Veda in the Çatapatha<brâhmaṇam x. 3, 3, 6: Yadda vai purushah svapiti, prânam tarhi vâg api-eti, prânam aakshuh, prânam manâh, prânam çrotram. Sa yadda prabudhyate, prãâdãh eva adhi- punar jâyante. (When a man sleeps, speech is merged in life, eye in life, mind in life, ear in life. And when he awakes they are reborn from life.)

§ 164. The intellect is nothing but a material organ with which the Will provides itself for the sake of regulating its relations with the outer world. Hence it is, that all productions of the conscious Will bear the stamp of outwardness, artificiality, mechanism as opposed to the inwardness, naturalness, organisation which distinguishes the creations of unconscious Will. Therefore with these no work of human skill can be even remotely compared. The unconscious Will operates in the vegetative functions of the organism throughout with adaptation, yet without consciousness, and thus without knowledge of the end to be attained. But marvellous indeed is the encroachment of this unconscious Will with its blind and yet adaptive activity on the sphere of conscious Will which is
manifested in Instinct and the artistic impulses of animals. That which operates in the bird building its nest, is obviously Will. And yet the year-old bird cannot have no consciousness of the purpose for which the nest is built. Consequently it must be unconscious, not conscious Will, Will working by irritation, not by motives, which appears in these instinctive operations, though the details of execution may be regulated by motives. Thus the same unconsciously-purposive action which prevails in the nutritive functions as the rule, trenches exceptionally as instinct on the domain of conscious life, and that always in such cases where the intellect is insufficient for the purposes of nature. Hence in man, owing to the perfection of his intellect, it shows itself but rarely (for instance, in sexual love). In animals it appears more frequently, and most strongly where the intellect is least perfect, while at the same time the vital operations remain complicated. Accordingly it reaches its climax in the social instincts of the insects. In proportion as the cerebral and sympathetic nervous systems in these coincide in the ganglia, their voluntary actions are regulated throughout by instinct and consequently stand under the same guidance as the involuntary functions of nutrition. Accordingly we might go so far as to consider a swarm of bees as an organism resolved into its component parts. Like the unconscious life of a single organism, the whole
social life of bees and ants is dependent on irritation, with this exception, that in details it is replaced by slight motives, because the contact is removed by which the operating of irritation is conditioned.

Remark.—The distribution of the different organic functions (nourishment, propagation) amongst different individuals, whether co-existing (queen bee, drones, and workers) or succeeding each other (caterpillar, butterfly), differs only in degree from the separation of the sexes among the higher animals and men, and operates, like the latter, under the guidance of instinct.

§ 165. Descending in the scale of organic beings we see conscious voluntary life ever retreating before the unconscious operation of the Will, until the former utterly disappears. The point where the last remnant of consciousness and voluntary movement is extinguished, marks the transition (difficult to determine empirically) from the animal to the vegetable kingdom. In the plant unconscious life, serving the purposes of nourishment and propagation, fills therefore the whole sphere of its existence. Now, as we have seen, unconscious no less than conscious life is the manifestation of Will. Consequently the life of the plant must be conceived as an unconscious, involuntary willing, and every plant, like animal and man, is an objectification of the Will to life. This is difficult to grasp only for the reason, that the sphere in which we immediately know Will, has here utterly disappeared, and that
sphere alone remains in which we can approach it only mediately and by inference. Meanwhile not only are the exertions which fill up the life of every plant, obviously the same as those of animals, namely, nourishment and propagation, but also their bodily organs show a striking analogy, since, for instance, the digestive organs reappear as roots, the respiratory organs as leaves, the genitals as blossoms. Further, a number of the manifestations of vegetable life, as, for instance, the striving of the root after good soil and moisture, that of the branches after light and air, as well as many single facts are inexplicable, unless we assume, as the inner principle of vegetable life, a desiring, a craving, a striving, in short a willing, albeit an unconscious one.

§ 166. No sharper boundary line is drawn in the whole of Nature than that between organic forces, appearing as living organisms, and inorganic forces, variously manifested in the physical and chemical processes of inanimate nature. Nevertheless considerations like the following show that the great difference between organic and inorganic forces after all concerns the form of appearance alone, but not that which appears in these entirely different forms. (1) In all effects, whether belonging to the sphere of animate or inanimate nature, that which manifests itself is force. Now force is related to its
manifestations not merely as a general concept to its different underlying perceptions (§ 100), but as the thing-in-itself to the phenomenal world (§ 136). Consequently the identity, denoted by the word force, is not an abstract but a concrete identity, and the diversity of operating forces springs not from the nature of force in itself, but from the forms of its appearance. (2) Accordingly the great diversity in the action of organic and inorganic forces is to be explained for the most part by their relation to the forms of appearance, that is, by circumstances of time, space, and causality. It is first of all causality which, as cause in its narrower sense, occasions inorganic, as irritation and motives, organic change (§§ 142-145), and thereby draws between both a boundary, admitting of no intermediate links. After causality it is time and space out of which arise the profound differences between organic and inorganic phenomena. While namely every organic force (plant or animal) succeeds in giving full expression to its being only in a variety of spatial parts (as organism) and in a succession of temporal conditions (as life), every inorganic force on the contrary reveals its whole inner being in an undivided and everywhere identical manifestation, admitting only of differences in degree. (The only exception is crystallisation, which may be regarded as a first attempt at organic life seized by rigidity in the very process of formation.) Hence
is clear that the essential differences between organic and inorganic forces find their explanation in relations of time, space, and causality, from which follows, that they do not originate in Being-in-itself, but only in the forms through which it appears to us.

We have only therefore to take that force-manifestation in which alone the being of force becomes accessible to our inner apprehension as Will, namely, our own self, and to strip from it all its appearance-forms, to which not only consciousness, but also life, and organisation belong, and we shall retain in the unconscious, inanimate, inorganic Will that which is manifested as inner impelling principle in all forces of inorganic nature.

Even clearer than by proof will this truth become, when we observe in detail the action of inorganic forces: when we see the eagerness with which substances enter into chemical combination, the vehemence with which the electric poles strive after union, the impetuosity with which the dammed-up water everywhere seeks an outlet, or when, in lifting a heavy weight or pressing against a solid body, we immediately feel how our striving is resisted by a contrary striving which fundamentally must be identical with the striving in ourselves and thus, like that,—Will, even though as gravity and impenetrability it shows the greatest possible distance in its form of appearance from our own Will.
VII. Transcendent Reflections on the Will as

Thing-in-itself

§ 167. All is matter. Such is the final conclusion from the standpoint of physical science (§ 26). Kant's doctrine alone leads beyond this, when proving that the essential conditions of corporeal existence, space, time, and causality, are only subjective faculties of our intellect, and that consequently the materiality of things is only the form in which the being of the thing-in-itself appears to our eyes. What that Being-in-itself is, was found in the only possible way by Schopenhauer. It is nothing but Will which, as physical, chemical, and organic force, intrudes into time, space, and causality, thereby appearing in all changes of bodies and in bodies themselves. To him who has understood Schopenhauer's teaching aright, every phenomenon of the universe, wherever we may look, is resolved into Will. Hence the final conclusion of metaphysical science is: All is Will.

§ 168. That which makes Will appear to us as world, is the innate forms of our intellect. As we cannot get rid of them, and Will as thing-in-itself lies beyond them, only negative assertions about Will are possible to us.

1. The Will as thing-in-itself is not in space
and time. Now all plurality is conditioned by a spatial co-existence or a temporal succession of parts. Although therefore the Will is manifested as a plurality of phenomena in space and time, in itself plurality is unknown to it. This truth has at all times been felt (ἐν καὶ πᾶν, One and All), but the proof of it is only possible by Kant’s philosophy.

2. Like plurality, divisibility is also conditioned by space and time. The Will as thing-in-itself is therefore indivisible. We must not think of it as divided amongst its phenomena; for each of these contains it entire, every being in nature is a manifestation of the whole and undivided Will to life, just as each of the thousand images of the sun in the water reflects the entire sun. When therefore Plato (Parm. p. 131 E) asks: τίν᾽ οὖν τρόπον τῶν εἴδων τὰ ἄλλα μεταληψεται, μήτε κατὰ μέρη μήτε κατὰ δῆλα μεταλαμβάνειν δυνάμενα;—the Bhagavad-gītā (xiii, 16) may answer:

avibhaktam ca bhūteshu, vibhaktam īva ca sthitam

(undivided he dwells in beings, and yet, as it were, divided); and Kant may furnish the key to this enigma by his doctrine that space and time do indeed separate the manifestations but not the manifested, so that every one finds and feels himself to be the entire, limitless Will to life, the totality
of all that is real. Hence it is, that the natural man (ἀνθρώπος ὑπνικός), as his deeds show, restricts all reality to his ego; he knows everything in himself. And hence it is, that the regenerate (in the Christian sense) extends his ego to all reality; he knows himself in everything. He celebrates solemnly (in the Communion) his unification with all creatures as a member of the body of Christ, τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πνημονικὸν (Ephes. i. 23), and Nature thousand-tongued greets him with the "great word," which we shall have later on to consider: "Tat tvam asi" (That art thou), while from his inmost being re-echoes the consciousness: "Aham brahma asmi" (I am Brahman).

3. All phenomena of the Will to life are subject to causality, and therefore, in all their manifestations, to necessity. On the contrary the Will, as thing-in-itself, does not lie in causality and is consequently uncaused and free. Here is the meeting-point of two great truths, that of the freedom of the Will, and that of the necessity of all its manifestations. It is true that our deeds are the necessary and inevitable results of our innate character (expressed in corporisation): and yet we cannot get rid of the consciousness of responsibility for our actions which is called conscience: and rightly so: for this innate character is after all our own work (§ 153), and our whole life is only the empirical and therefore necessary development of our in itself free willing. This
truth finds its mythical expression in the Indian doctrine, that all deeds and destinies of our existence are the inevitable, though not immediate (apārva), consequence of our own actions in a previous life, and so dependent on ourselves. And the same truth seems to be in Plato's mind, when he describes (Rep. x, p. 617 D sq.) how the soul before its birth chooses with freedom from the lap of Lachesis the lot which predestines with necessity its fate and, with its fate (618 D, E), its actions in the future life.

§ 169. Will as such has two possible modes and two alone: willing and not-willing. In reference to earthly existence willing appears (as we shall show in the metaphysics of morality) as the affirmation of the Will to life, of which this whole world is the manifestation; not-willing as the denial of the Will to life, the manifestation of which has been called by religions in their figurative language bliss, unio mystica, Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven, etc., but which, apart from its breaking through in every moral action, remains completely unknown to the intellect, nay is absolutely inconceivable by it. To the intellect therefore it appears as the negation, the extinction (nirvāṇam) of all existence. Yet it is well to notice that it is only to our understanding, bound to the finite and its limits, that this world of affirmation appears as the existing, and negation as the non-existing. On the contrary, viewed from the
highest standpoint, the world of denial, unknown to us, yet transparent in every moral deed, is that which really and truly is (τὸ ὁν), while on the other hand this whole world of affirmation metaphysically speaking is that which is not (τὸ μὴ ὁν), and in a moral sense that which should not be.

VIII. Mythical Representation of the World-Process

§ 170. There where there is no longer a Where,—therefore here, everywhere and again nowhere,—then when there is no longer a When,—therefore now, in all eternity and again at no time,—was, is, and will be the Will (the Deity, the Brahman, the Thing-in-itself), and besides it nothing. Each of us is this Will, and again each of us is not this Will: for we are all estranged from its original nature, which is Denial—without sin, without sorrow, without existence.

§ 171. Now there was formed,—not at any time, but before all eternity, to-day and for ever,—like an inexplicable clouding of the clearness of the heavens, in the pure, painless, and will-less bliss of denial a morbid propensity, a sinful bent: the affirmation of the Will to life. In it and with it is given the myriad host of all the sins and woes of which this immeasurable world is the revealer.
§ 172. When in the life of our body some serious disorder has taken place, nature by a violent augmentation of the vital processes summons all her powers for the purpose of curing it. Thus arises fever, which is at the same time the symptom of disease and an attempt at cure. What fever is to disease, that is this whole world to the self-affirming Will. It is the visibility of affirmation; and in giving to all sin and its train of evils the most full and terrible expression, it holds up to the erring Will a mirror of its own striving, guilty of all the woe of existence, if haply it might attain to a full understanding of itself, and thereby come to a turn, to a return, to salvation.

§ 173. Salvation springs from knowledge (jñāṇad muktih, Kapila 3, 23). Now the full knowledge of the world is only possible by means of the human intellect. Therefore all nature up to man is but the way which the affirming Will travels in gradual development, in order to attain to the human intellect and by it to saving self-knowledge. But also as man it passes through long series of generations, furnishing itself in every womb with a new intellect, in order to approach by progressive purification the realm of denial (§ 250).

§ 174. Long periods in the life of nature had to elapse before an intellect could arise. On the other hand all these past world-epochs are only possible
through time, and this again through intellect. 

Herein lies a contradiction only for our imperfect 
understanding, because of its being bound to tempo-
rality. This, however, in the process of the world 
has no significance. Therefore the fall of the spirits 
took place from time immemorial, and again it takes 
place now and at each moment. But saving denial 
also is ever present, and in denying, the individual 
saves himself and in himself all creatures, even 
because he is in himself the entire Will to life. 
When therefore it stands in the Veda (Chândogya-
upanishad 5, 24, 5):

Yathâ itâ kshudhitañ bâlá mâtaram pari-upâsate 
 evaṃ sarvâni bhûtâni agnihotram upâsate,

“as here below hungry children sit round their 
mother, so sit all beings round the fire-sacrifice 
(brought by him, who has the knowledge of 
Brahman),”—we might perhaps add as explana-
tion in the language of the Bible (Rom. viii. 19):

ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν 
vίῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. Thus the regenerate 
saves himself and the groaning creation: and yet 
affirmation still continues, even after he has found 
the way out of its circle. Also this world for ever 
and aye will exist, will affirm, will suffer,—but again 
all time in the light of denial is nothing, and all 
that it contains fades away as the shadow-play on 
the wall for the Will, when it has turned.
Thus contradictory appears metaphysical truth, when we attempt to clothe it in the words and conceptions of empirical thought.

IX. God and World

§ 175. There is nothing but Will; its true state is denial (as is proved by the approbation we give to every moral, that is denying action). An aberration of the Will is affirmation, of which this whole world is the manifestation and the purifying process.

In these words, which can only be thoroughly understood later, lies the metaphysical truth, which for all times and countries is one and the same. Accordingly we see it springing up wherever the human mind penetrates to the depths, even though the form in which it appears, shows the greatest varieties.

To exhibit this identical content and to derive its various forms from the influence of the respective civilisations, is the subject of the history of metaphysics. Here we must content ourselves with pointing out some of the most important of these forms.

§ 176. In India we can trace metaphysics back almost to its first beginnings. The forces, appearing in the manifestations of nature and more especially
in the striking phenomena of fire, thunderstorm, the firmament, etc., are presented in the hymns of the \textit{Rigveda} in transparent personification as the gods \textit{Agni, Indra, Varuṇa}, etc. Nay, to a certain extent we see the forces of nature even in the hands of the poets crystallising into personal gods. This primitive view of the world is true, so far as man recognises in all action of nature his own being (Will); it is untrue, so far as he transfers not only his own being, but also its form of appearance (personality) to the forces of nature.

We know that these forces from the lowest to the highest are only the original forms in which the Will to life variously appears. This truth came to light in the second period of Indian life in the conception, that there is but one Being, the (impersonal) \textit{Brahman}, and that all gods, men, animals, plants, and inanimate beings are the diverse manifestations of it. The relation between phenomena and the thing-in-itself is conceived figuratively as an emanation of the world from \textit{Brahman}, compared to the coming forth of the web from the spider, the plants from the earth, the hair from the body. But at the same time the eternity of the souls, for ever circulating in the \textit{Samsāra} (that is in the phenomenal world) is maintained; from which follows clearly, that their relation to \textit{Brahman} is to be conceived not as the temporal relation of the effect to its cause, but as the relation of the time-conditioned to the timeless, that is, of
phenomena to the thing-in-itself. With this metaphysical antithesis between the undivided Brahman and the manifold world, as which it appears, is immediately connected the ethical between denial and affirmation in the sense of the celebrated "Tat tvam asi" (That art Thou), a sentence which expresses in three words at once the deepest mystery of metaphysics (the ἄν καλ πᾶν) and the highest aim of morality (the ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν). As an interpretation of this great truth we may consider, as in a wider sense our whole work, so already the motto prefixed to it, which we here translate:

"The Lord of all things dwells
In ev'ry living being,
Not dying when it dies.—
He who sees him, is seeing.

Such will not, when in all
This highest Lord he knows,
Wrong through himself himself,
And to perfection goes."

§ 177. In the Bible we have before our eyes the grand spectacle of the real and eternal truth breaking its way forcibly as Christianity through the diametrically opposed teaching of the Old Testament.

The fundamental dogma of primitive Judaism is Theism, according to which the world is created by
a personal Being, similar to ourselves (Gen. i. 26, 27), —a hypothesis at the boldness of which we are not surprised only because we are accustomed to hear it from our youth up. The first consequence of Theism is Optimism. If the world is created by God, it must be good, and this is expressly asserted (Gen. i. 31). A further consequence is complete Annihilation by death: only what is uncreated can be immortal; if the soul has arisen from nothing, it must return to nothing: τὸ μηδὲν εἰς οὐδὲν ἰέτει (what is nothing turns to nothing). Accordingly the Old Testament (with the exception of the latest books) does not admit the immortality of the soul. Now, if our existence is limited to this life of affirmation, our aims can be only immanent and consequently egoistic. Therefore the Law appeals solely to egoism, in making its incentives fear of punishment and hope of reward (one may read Lev. xxvi. Deut. xxviii.), on which account it was rejected by the deeper conception of Christianity (Rom. iii. 28).

This view of the world, in which Theism, Optimism, Nihilism, and Eudaemonism cohere with admirable consistency, seems to have been not so much a result of natural development, as rather the inspiration of a single man,—perhaps of Moses,—whose greatness it is not easy to overrate,—who found in it the means of disciplining a race corrupted by slavery. With the people it never became very popular, as the frequent, and otherwise rather inexplicable at-
tempts at apostasy seem to prove. But also the thinkers of Hebraism struggle against it in many passages of the Old Testament. So already in the narrative of the Fall, which cannot be reconciled with the creation of the world by an all-wise and good Being. Still less could the human mind acquiesce in the doctrine of the punishment of the evil and the reward of the good in this life, a theory contradicted by experience at every step (compare Job and Psalms xxxvii. lxxiii).

A fundamental change took place in Hebrew metaphysics during and after the Babylonian Captivity through Persian and Greek influence, which prepared the ground for Christianity. To Theism was added the doctrine of Satan (that is Anhromainyu), which made it possible to exonerate God from the authorship of evil (still ascribed to him for instance in Isa. xlv. 7, 2 Sam. xxiv. r, but no longer in the post-exilic parallel passage in 1 Chron. xxi. [xxii.] r), and to maintain him as the principle of denial, that is morality. At the same time the belief in the immortality of the soul and with it a transcendent morality, not founded on egoism, broke way, while Optimism, in consequence of bitter experience, gradually gave place to Pessimism, which is the basis of every real religion.

In this intellectual atmosphere we see the eternal and everywhere identical truth as Christianity struggling painfully upwards, like a plant through
rock and rubble, towards the light. Adapting its theory to the Old Testament and to the historical traditions of the life of its founder, Christianity personifies (Rom. v. 12-21) the affirmation of the Will to life in Adam, the denial of it in Christ. We are all (according to the theory of original sin) Adam, and we all shall become Christ through his being formed in us (Gal. iv. 19). This cannot be effected by the Law (not so much, because, according to the Pauline theory, it cannot be fulfilled, but rather because it is founded on egoism, and therefore, even if fulfilled, does not lead beyond this). To Christianity therefore the springing up of metaphysical knowledge, independently of our Will while in the state of affirmation, appears as Grace, which accomplishes in us regeneration, that is the returning of the Will to denial. Thus the truth as Christianity burst the hardened bark of the contradictory and in itself untrue Mosaic teaching, the consciousness of which inspired the fourth Evangelist (chap. i. 17, 18), with the words: ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀληθεία διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο (thus not by Moses). Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἐώρακε πώποτε (thus not even Moses, as is maintained, Num. xii. 8, Deut. xxxiv. 10), ὁ μονογενὴς νῦς, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. Compare the sidelong glances he occasionally throws (for instance chapts. iii. 10, iv. 21, v. 39, vi. 49 [viii. 6], viii. 58, x. 8) on the religion of the fathers.
§ 178. Also the gods of the Greeks, as is apparent from the etymology of their names and the character of many of their myths, were originally personified forces of nature (comp. Plato, Kratyl. 397 c), moulded by the poetic genius of the Homeric age into ideal human figures (Herodot. 2, 53). In opposition to the necessarily discordant plurality of gods Xenophanes proclaimed the unity of the Divine. His disciple Parmenides (as already Xenophanes in part himself) denied to this unity personality and change and opposed it as Being to this world as Non-being: whereby the distinction between phenomena and the thing-in-itself was very sharply expressed. Proceeding from Parmenides Plato examined the nature of Being. In the phenomenal world with its ceaseless becoming and perishing he discovered a series of constant forms which, as eternal types of things, find expression in all that exists, but are themselves untouched by the flux of becoming. These prototype types of things, lying beyond time, space and causality (§ 47), each of which is manifested as a formative principle of being in a plurality of similar individual things, were called by Plato Ideas (ιδέαι, ἑιδη, that is, perceptual forms). What he sought under this name can be nothing but the series of formative forces through which the Will finds expression in all manifestations of nature. Ideas therefore must be well distinguished from Concepts,
which indeed share with them their universality (the ἐν ἐπὶ οὐκολλάων), but lack their concrete form and thorough-going determinedness, for which reason Platonic Ideas were rightly denoted by Aristotle as αἰσθητὰ ἄδεια, though not rightly as such rejected by him. Meanwhile it is not to be denied that in the philosophy of Plato, to whom was lacking on the one side knowledge of nature and on the other a complete system of logic, Ideas and concepts are not duly discriminated. Thus we can consider ourselves as Platonists only so far as we are permitted to retain in the case of Plato (as in other respects in that of Kant) what is true and excellent in his teaching, purified from wrong ingredients. Here therefore we distinguish strictly once and for all between the Idea as unity, not yet broken up into plurality of individuals by its entrance into the forms of time, space and causality, and the Concept, which is unity re-established by abstract thought out of the plurality of individual things. Accordingly, to Concepts, as abstract outlines of perceptual representations, we can grant no other existence than that in the human mind, while by Ideas we understand, neither (with Plato) mere abstractions as the Good, the Beautiful, nor (with Kant) certain concepts of reason transcending the possibility of experience (soul, universe, God), but solely the physical, chemical, and organic forces underlying all action in nature, since
these are the forms through which the Will to life gives, in gradually increasing distinctness, expression to its essence. In this sense therefore we appropriate the Platonic Ideas, and make them the starting-point of our further considerations.

X. The Will and the Ideas of Plato

§ 179. Retrospect and further problems. We have recognised Will as the inner principle of all manifestations of nature and have given some characteristics of its essence (necessary to the understanding of what follows, though themselves only to be clearly comprehended in the course of our whole inquiry). We have further pointed out the harmony of our fundamental theory with the culminating points of metaphysics in all ages and countries. There now remains for us to show in this second part devoted to nature, how the thing-in-itself appears as the world, that is, how the one, free and existence-denying Will (by means of a change not further explicable to us, but originating in its freedom) affirming itself in the forms of our intellect, time, space and causality, which are the principles of the visibility of affirmation, appears as a plurality of beings, subject to the constraint of causality, separated by space and time, and (in so far as they do not penetrate the illusive nature of
the order imposed by the intellect and its form) persisting in mutual hostility.

§ 180. The affirmation of the Will to life is its state of being split into plurality in the forms of our intellect: space, time, and causality. Now the Will in itself is absolutely unformed and therefore completely heterogeneous to these forms of the subject. In order therefore to appear in them, it must to a certain extent adapt itself to them. This the Will does in shaping itself to a series of operative forms of existence, through which, in self-combat, it forces its way into time, space and causality, and comes to appearance in all individual existence. These original Will-forms, opposed to perishable things as their imperishable prototypes, are precisely what Plato sought and partly found under the name of Ideas, and what we shall have shortly to enumerate as the Forces manifested in the life of nature. They are called the grades of objectification, because through them the Will to life with ever-increasing distinctness brings its being to appearance. Thus these Ideas are the footprints on the road, by which the affirming Will, sunk to existence and striving after deliverance, painfully works its way upward to its complete revelation in Man. This, being its real and final goal, was only possible by the long preceding series of grades; for mankind presupposes both the animal and the vegetable worlds, as these
again presuppose inorganic nature for their existence as well as subsistence.

§ 181. Since Ideas lie beyond empirical reality, that is where nothing is to be found but the thing-in-itself, they are at bottom identical with this, but they are the thing-in-itself as it appears to our eyes, when we conceive it objectively and, so to say, regard it through the atmosphere of the phenomenal world. They are the coloured pictures in the glass of the magic lantern through which the light of the Will throws on the wall of time, space, and causality the shadow-play of the phenomenal world. Or we may compare the Will to a harper, and its appearance in the life and action of nature to the music. The Ideas would then be the not very numerous strings of the instrument from the ever-varying combination of which proceeds the inexhaustible wealth of the progressing harmony.

§ 182. Ideas are concrete forms adapted to space, moreover a plurality. Yet, as even Plato saw (§ 47), they do not lie in space. From this contradiction it becomes clear, that they can only be regarded as an imperfect attempt to make conceivable to us what is in its nature inconceivable. From the plurality of Ideas spring all differences in nature, for, since these do not originate in the intellect, which remains one and the same towards all diversity, all differences
must be rooted in the thing-in-itself. But how the unity or rather non-plurality of being-in-itself can be reconciled with the differences of the phenomenal world rooted in it, is, like the possibility of a plurality of Ideas, a transcendent question, which passes our comprehension. For us indeed unity and plurality are opposites, for the thing-in-itself both and with them their opposition are nothing.

For the rest Ideas do not thoroughly suffice for the explanation of the phenomenal world, for the variety in the individuals representing one Idea can be satisfactorily explained neither by the more or less imperfect subdual of the matter, seized upon and moulded by the Idea, nor by the adaptation to external circumstances (by which are conditioned the varieties of species). On the contrary in man as in part already in the higher animals (also in this respect his precursors), the specific character, in which is expressed the idea of the species, is supplemented by the individual character, which for us is an impenetrable mystery (omne individuum est ineffabile) and seems to indicate the stage which every individual has reached on its way to denial. This dark point will receive some more light in our further considerations.

Remark.—If one compares antique sculpture with mediæval and modern painting, the characters of Sophokles with those of Shakespeare, and lastly, the Platonic doctrine of Ideas with Schopenhauer’s doctrine of Will, one might, inferring the
nature of the age from these its highest manifestations, conjecture that the individuals of classical antiquity had more of the typical, less of the individual in them than those of modern times, that consequently the modern man has become more conscious of himself, perhaps even has approached nearer to denial than the ancient. This assumption, which might be interpreted very much in favour of Christianity, must at any rate be understood, not as a progress of mankind in general, which in the main was and ever will be impossible, but rather as an approaching ascent of the individual towards denial.

XI. The Objectification of the Will in Nature by means of the Ideas

§ 183. Every physical, chemical and organic force is a Platonic Idea, that is, one of these primary forms through which the Will comes to expression in all manifestations of the universe. To facilitate the understanding of this doctrine we here draw up tentatively a list of all primary forces, which however contains much that is questionable, and without doubt will admit of many improvements. The goal which by this means we aim at rather than reach, is the enumeration of the total content of what is a posteriori in nature, that is, of that part which remains when we take away the a priori elements of time, space and causality with all that belongs to them (such as extension, divisibility, inertia).
A. Physical Forces:

(1) Impenetrability; its mere negation is Porosity, on which depends the Compressibility of bodies.

(2) Gravity, perhaps connected with cohesion.

(3) Cohesion, appearing in three degrees as solid (φιλα), liquid, and gaseous (νεicos). Different varieties of the same are hardness and softness, brittleness and toughness, ductility and perhaps elasticity.

(4) Adhesion, closely related to cohesion; to it may be referred the capillarity, endosmose, and absorption of gases.

(5) Heat (Temperature); connected on the one hand with cohesion, the three forms of which are conditioned by it, on the other in a peculiar way with light.

(6) Light, perhaps to be regarded neither as a body (according to the emission hypothesis), nor as a change of body (according to the undulatory hypothesis), but rather as a force which, appearing like every force in consequence of certain causal influences, is manifested in all bodies, on the one side in luminosity, on the other in visibility as its correlative.

(7) Magnetism and Diamagnetism, probably more or less common to all matter.

(8) Electricity, closely related to magnetism,
appears as a polaric contrast (usually latent in bodies, but manifesting itself in consequence of certain causal influences), the poles of which striving after union attract their complement in other bodies.

(9) Crystallisation, a striving, perhaps common to all matter, to assume in its transition from the liquid to the solid state a regular form, according to the nature of each substance: a prelude to organic force.

B. Chemical Forces:

(1) Each of the 66 Elements.
(2) Every Chemical Combination.

C. Organic Forces:

(1) Each species of plant.
(2) Each species of animal.
(3) Man.

§ 184. In this list (presupposing its correctness) we have before our eyes the whole apparatus of Ideas, that is of forces, through which the Will to life affirms itself, in penetrating through these into time, space, and causality, and appearing in all changes of bodies as well as in the bodies themselves. One should accustom oneself to see in every process of nature a mutual interpenetration of forces, and to regard that which alone is operative
in these forces as identical with what works and strives in us as Will. For, as already a very ancient passage of the Veda (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka-upanishad 3, 7, 15) says: "Yahi sarveshu bhūteshu tishṭhan sarvebhyo bhūtebhyo 'naro, yaman sarvāṇi bhūtāṇi na vidur, yasya sarvāṇi bhūtāṇi cārtanā, yahi sarvāṇi bhūtāṇi antaro yanayati,—esha te atmā, antaryāmī, amritah".—"he who dwelling in all beings differs from all beings, who is not known to all beings, of whom all beings are the embodiment, who from within governs all beings,—he is thy soul, thy inner ruler, thy immortal part."

Remark.—Such passages as the above show clearly, that the Brahman of the Indians, which, as we saw, lies outside of time, space, and causality (47), which "in the sleeper remains awake, forming and working at pleasure" (comp. § 163), in which, according to other texts of the Veda, "the sun rises and sets," "on which all gods depend" (§ 176), "all worlds are founded," and which yet again "dwell in size as a thumb-breadth in the cavity of the heart,"—that this Brahman, the unity of which with the soul (brahma-ātma-ākya) is the fundamental dogma of the Vedānta, notwithstanding the intelligence ascribed to it (§ 154), is after all nothing else but what we call Will. This might explain what is already said in a hymn of the Rigveda (10. 129), that out of the Tād (that is Brahman) there arose through tapas (self-renunciation, turning of the Will, here to affirmation) first Kāma ("Eros, also according to Hesiod and Parmenides the eldest of the gods), that is affirmation, and that this became the first germ of manas, that is of intellect (§ 84), which also according to our system is only the principle of the visibility of affirmation (§§ 117, 172. 173. 179. 180).
Thus, apart from errors in details, the Brahman of the Indians, the Ideas of Plato, the Creator and Savigur of Christianity, the Thing-in-itself of Kant, the Forces of natural science, and the Will of Schopenhauer, constitute an indissoluble totality of metaphysical truth.

§ 185. All the above-named forces, through which the Will objectifies itself in order to appear in time, space, and causality, are restricted to matter (§§ 86-88) as their place of appearance. Yet the relation of physical, chemical, and organic forces to matter is a characteristically different one. While namely the relation of organic forces to matter is, as we shall see, an accidental one, the physical and chemical forces on the contrary are attached to it with necessity, and that so that in every substance are inherent (as it seems) all physical forces, but only certain, alternating, and mutually exclusive chemical forces. These chemical forces appear to our space-bound comprehension as the various substances in nature, and their general character seems to be, that each of them constitutes an aggregate of all the physical forces, but shows these in gradually and characteristically determined combinations. Thus one might regard the physical Ideas as the real combatants, the chemical as the commanders of the troops in this bellum omnium contra omnes.

§ 186. The physical forces inhere one and all, as it seems, in every substance, though in variously
graduated differences of intensity, in which indeed consists the diversity of inorganic bodies, that is, of all chemical elements and combinations occurring in nature. Accordingly all bodies, the moment causality permits, should show themselves as (1) impenetrable; (2) more or less heavy; (3) striving to hold together or to scatter their particles; (4) more or less adhesive; (5) more or less warm; (6) more or less visible (colours); (7) magnetic or diamagnetic; (8) electric; (9) capable of crystallisation.

§ 187. Chemical forces, like physical, are also necessarily inherent in matter, yet they do not appear like these in every substance, but each of them in one particular substance, to which it is restricted once and for all. Thus, for instance, gold is a chemical force, which shows certain distinct physical properties, that is, it holds the physical forces captive in its service in certain relations, modifiable in a particular way by causality. This force, as a chemical one, is restricted once and for all to a particular place of appearance, movable in space, into which we project it and so construe it as body. In this sense every part of matter is the place of appearance of particular elements and particular chemical combinations, which, being equally primary forces of nature and captors of physical Ideas, wrestle with each other for the possession of matter, while causal influences decide which force remains victor over
matter, and which is temporarily subdued. Thus, for instance, a certain substance appears now as oxygen and hydrogen, now as water, according as causality favours the one or the other. For water is by no means a regular aggregate of oxygen and hydrogen, but like these a throughout homogeneous substance, and therefore just as much as the elements to which it temporarily yields the field, the objectification of a primary force of nature, which, however, in order to become manifest, is restricted to the same substance as the elementary forces in competition with it. In order to maintain the purity of the species as the established grades of objectification, for which here as in the organic sphere nature takes the greatest care, elements can only combine in certain determined relations of weight. Yet these are only the accessory, not the essential condition of the manifestation of natural force as a chemical combination, that is, they do not belong to it, but to the causal conditions under which it appears. Often therefore very different forces have their place of manifestation in the same elements, combined in the same proportions of weight (as for instance starch, ligneous fibre, sugar in C$_6$H$_6$O$_6$, or, if one regards these as organic rather than chemical forces, calcareous spar, arragonite, marble, chalk in CaO$\cdot$CO$_2$).

As organic bodies come into existence by generation, so inorganic bodies are produced by chemical
affinity. Now, just as the sexual impulse is but the first intrusion into appearance of that Will which later stands before us in time as organism (§ 153), so affinity is nothing but the desire for manifestation of those chemical forces which, after their manifestation, are seen by us spatially as (simple or compound) bodies.

Remark.—Notwithstanding the variety of natural forces, all action in nature goes back to a unity. But this unity, which we have recognised as identical with the Will in ourselves, is not physical but metaphysical. When, therefore, natural science endeavours to reduce all forces of nature to a physical unity, we must regard this as a trespassing beyond the limits of its sphere (indicated § 25), which in our estimation can have no lasting success. It is to this endeavour to explain nature by one physical principle, that the atomic theory owes its existence, the aim of which is to interpret all processes in nature as the varied union and separation of mechanically moved atoms. We may suppose these atoms either as extensionless and so mathematically indivisible, or as extended and therefore only physically indivisible. If the first, then by no amount of such atoms, however great, could an extended body and consequently a world be produced. If atoms should on the other hand be merely physically indivisible, they must be conceived as minute bodies the cohesive power of which resists all separation, while they are only by accident, that is relatively to our body and its organs, so small, that they (unfortunately) entirely escape our perception and thus remain nothing but a mere hypothesis (with which we believe it possible to dispense). Hence is evident, that the atomic theory, in the most favourable case, would lead not to unity of force but to the reduction of the forces ruling in nature to a few (such as impenetrability, cohesion, adhesion, chemical attraction). Such a result (which after all
might be easily reconciled with our system) would, however, be applicable only in a subordinate degree for interpreting natural phenomena. For the undeniably teleological constitution of nature, of which we shall shortly have to speak, will for ever mock all attempts to explain the universe by a merely mechanical operation of forces.

§ 188. As the physical forces are seized and bound to a particular place by the chemical, so again are physical and chemical forces in that mutual interpenetration which empirically speaking is called matter, temporarily fettered by the organic forces, in which the Will appears in significant gradation as plant, animal, and man. The Will, it is true, appears entire and undivided in every physical and chemical force (§ 168, 2). But while in these it manifests its being in a dull, one-sided way, and almost only in a simple and (apart from differences in degree) identical manifestation (§ 166); as organic force it expands itself, for the clearer expression and unfolding of its being, into a plurality of parts in space as organism, and into a plurality of conditions in time as life.

§ 189. The physical and chemical forces are necessarily inherent in matter (that is, in force-filled space): if I think them away, I abolish all matter; they have therefore their omnipresence and immortality in the indestructibility of matter. On the other hand, organic forces cling, as it were, accidentally to matter, for they have their essence not
in matter but in its form. To conserve this form, they need continually the supply of new materials, and in order not to lose matter for ever, when abandoning it in death, they require a means to perpetuate their existence beyond the individual. Hence the instincts of nourishment and propagation, which form the two fundamental impulses of all organic beings.

Remark.—When we reflect how Nature everywhere with a seeming indifference gives over to destruction her marvellously formed organisms, while providing with the greatest care for the preservation of the species through the strength of the procreative impulse and the abundance of seeds, we must conclude that to her the production of the individual is very easy and that of the species very difficult. How the latter, that is, how the first entrance of organic Ideas into the phenomenal world is to be represented empirically, is for philosophy a secondary question, the ventilation of which, however, being now in fashion, seems of primary importance. Since in going back in the history of our planet we come to a state in which the temperature of the earth admitted of no organic life, we must necessarily assume a first origination of the organic out of the inorganic through spontaneous generation (*generatio aequivoxa*). This is in fact no more marvellous than is for instance the crystallisation of water in the air into the so regularly formed and complicated snow crystals, and, like this, is to be regarded as the entrance of Will from spacelessness into space. From the first organisms produced by spontaneous generation must have arisen by development all existing species, whether produced (according to Cuvier) independently of each other, or (according to Lamarck and Darwin) the one from the other. Many facts, in particular the “unity of type” in the formation of organisms,
favour the latter theory. In no case, however, are we thereby justified in effacing the bounds, so strictly drawn by nature between species and species. And as little can we assume, with Darwin, that the production of higher out of lower species is due chiefly to external mechanical influences ("the struggle for existence"). Against his theory there are the following objections: (1) Why do we meet in nature, as also in fossils, a series of fixed grades and not a continuous chain of graduated forms, leading the one into the other? Why is it just these intermediate links and not rather the lower species which have perished in the struggle for existence? (2) The Will to life objectifies itself entire and undivided in every species of the plant and animal kingdom. Each of these therefore, the highest as the lowest, is equally perfect and equally fit for life, for all its organs cannot but correspond exactly to the aims of the Will manifested in them, since they are these aims themselves conceived as bodily parts. Hence follows, that every individual is the more perfect and the more fit for life, the nearer it approaches the type of its species, since perfection is nothing but fitness for the aims of life, and the type of the species, that is the Idea, is just that fitness—viewed as a fixed form—of all parts and functions to the respective ends of the Will, objectifying itself through the Idea. Therefore a deviation from the type of the species is never "advantageous" to the existence of an animal, unless perhaps transitorily, through adaptation to external circumstances, with the removal of which it appears as a deformity, prejudicial to the perfection of the animal, and therefore to its fitness for life.

Natural selection presupposes a selector, the struggle for existence a struggler. This is the Will to life, which, striving after deliverance, has in accommodation to external circumstances risen from grade to grade, from Idea to Idea. These transitions may have been effected in one of two ways, either by the Will springing in a favourable moment from the lower
to the higher grade, or by the agency of intermediate links which, as hybrids, were dropped after having served their purpose. For nature everywhere shows itself anxious to preserve—in the inorganic realm by equivalents, in the organic by sterility—the purity of the species, that is, of the Ideas conceived empirically, and only admits of certain variations within these, which may be regarded as the Idea adapting itself to different external circumstances.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that, from our standpoint, every moral objection to the descent of man from brute disappears. For all nature is, as we saw, but a metaphysical essence, sunk through its own guilt to physical existence and working its way upward to full self-knowledge, which it reaches in man, and through which alone it attains to salvation. Thus Darwinism and Christianity, like all fundamental contradictions of natural science, religion, and philosophy, are reconciled in the system of Schopenhauer.

§ 190. As the Will to life as plant concentrates its whole being in reproduction, it has at this stage the power of transforming inorganic materials into organic. Since it finds all these in one place, it does not need the power of locomotion. As animal the Will furnishes itself, in correspondence to its more complicated aims, with voluntary movement, and, for the guidance of its steps, with an intellect, of which, when insufficient, the unconscious Will, as we saw (§ 164), vicariously takes the place. The animal intellect reaches its highest possible development (§ 115, 4) in man. Beyond him it needs no further development, since in man the Will
attains to turning, to denial, to salvation, and with that to the really ultimate aim of the natural creation.

XII. On the Teleological View of Nature and its Limits

§ 191. The Will as thing-in-itself is one and harmonious. To its affirmation as world on the other hand self-contrast is essential, becoming visible in the plurality of its manifestations in time and space. Beyond the phenomenal world there is harmony, within it discord. Now not only the Will, but also the Ideas through which it is manifested, lie beyond space and time. Therefore, as their plurality is an unspatial one (§ 182), so also their contrariety is not a mutually exclusive, but rather a harmoniously co-operative one.

From this unity and harmony of the being-in-itself of Will, manifested in every organism through a particular Idea and in all existence through the totality of Ideas, is to be explained the teleological adaptation in nature, which meets us everywhere, and which, when connecting the manifestations of life in the individual organism to a unity, we call internal; and when appearing as a relation of different organisms to each other and to inorganic nature in the universal life of creation, external.
§ 192. The one Will to life, in objectifying itself entire and undivided in every living being, appears expanded in a plurality of parts in space as organism, and in a plurality of conditions in time as life. On this depends that internal adaptation, by means of which all parts of an organism show a mutual dependence, so that each organ seems both aim and means of all others, while again the organism and its life appears as the ultimate aim of all the organs. Of this we have already spoken (§ 158). Beside this we notice to our surprise an analogous phenomenon, a certain external adaptation, permeating the totality of nature, in so far as the different organic Ideas through which the Will appears in the higher grades of its objectifications, adapt themselves to a certain extent in part mutually to each other, in part to inorganic nature and its conditions, a correspondence which can only be explained by the unity of all Ideas grounded in the Will as thing-in-itself. Thus, for instance, we see the plant adapting itself to soil and climate, the animal to its element, to its prey, nay (through the teleological formation of its protective organs), to its natural enemy. Thus the eye is formed to correspond to light, the lungs to air, and just as later manifestations adjust themselves to the earlier, so we see (for instance in the adaptation of the atmosphere, of light and heat to organic life, in the obliquity of the ecliptic by which...
vegetable life is conditioned, etc.) earlier manifestations anticipating the later, and forming themselves with regard to the future needs of these. For the unity of nature appearing here is a transcendent unity, for which temporal conditions and so an earlier and a later have no significance.

The teleological order of nature is, on the one side, a constitutive principle of existence, on the other hand, a regulative principle of knowledge (in organic nature perfectly reliable). It may therefore well have been this which was in Plato's mind as "the Idea of the Good," of which he says, that like the sun it is the cause on the one hand of being, on the other of knowing (Rep. vi. p. 509 B).

§ 193. To this harmony of Ideas, on the mutual correspondence and accommodation of which depends the teleological constitution of nature, appears in crying contradiction the discord in the manifestation of these same Idées in space, time, and causality. They all, as phenomenal forms of the Will to life, possessed by the mania of existence as by a demon, force themselves with impetuosity into being, in mutually disputing matter and therefore perpetually combating, hindering, supplanting, and suppressing each other. Thus Plato's doctrine of the Idea of the Good and the unenvious goodness of the Creator is reconciled with the verdict of Heraclitus: πόλεμος
πατὴρ πάντων. From this bellum omnium contra omnes springs in a moral respect on the one hand the evil, on the other, the suffering of the world, both of which therefore are essential to affirmation and can only be removed with it. And again in an aesthetic respect arises from it the imperfection of phenomena, especially in the organic sphere, as a result of which every phenomenon gives only an approximate expression to the Idea manifested in it, since a part of the force striving for manifestation is everywhere consumed in the combating and subduing of opposed forces. Hence the law, "that every organism only represents the Idea of which it is the image, after deduction of that part of its force, employed by it in the subdual of those lower forces which dispute matter with it."

§ 194. Thus we see; wherever the eye turns, only phenomena, not things-in-themselves; and the whole realm of nature, wherever expanded in all spheres of the heavens, shows us indeed in all its parts, the thousandfold-repeated images, εἴδωλα, ὀμοιώματα of Ideas, but not Ideas, not Will, not Being-in-itself. Thus Plato was right, when he compared us (Rep. vii. p. 514 A sq.) to prisoners, sitting chained in an underground cave and forced by their fetters to look without moving on the wall in front of them, so that they see neither the light at their back, nor the objects passing behind them,
nor even themselves, but only the shadows of these objects and their own shadows on the wall before them, and take these for the real things. Is it possible for us to turn away our gaze from this wall of time, space and causality, in order to see no longer the shadows of things, no longer the images of Ideas, but the prototypes, as they are in themselves, the Ideas themselves in unspoiled form and beauty?

This question leads us to the considerations in our third part.