

# Kierkegaard and Schelling: The Life of Becoming

*Anette Ejsing*

## 1. The Miracle of Self

In addition to the loss of oneself, the most radical loss of all is to also lose hope in the source from which one can receive one's self, »because despair is indeed the loss of the eternal and of oneself« (*SD* 62; *SV2* 11, 196).<sup>1</sup> It is one thing not to have a self, but quite another not to anticipate ever acquiring one; this is, perhaps, the deepest kind of suffering there is. The question is, however, whether such suffering is solely negative in its effects. It might just be, as Kierkegaard suggests, that despair is escorted by its own opposite – possibility – which would entail recovering the hope of redemption from despair:

When someone faints, we call for water, eau de Cologne, smelling salts; but when someone wants to despair, then the word is: Get possibility, get possibility, possibility is the only salvation. A possibility – then the person in despair breathes again, he revives again, for without possibility a person seems unable to breathe (*SD* 38; *SV2* 11, 170f.).

Experiencing despair in its ultimate sense of losing hope means entering a state of suffering that exceeds the pain of mere deprivation. In Kierkegaard's view, despair has three aspects. It involves the despair of either desperately not wanting to be what one already is or of desperately wanting to be exactly that, both of which he identifies as rebellious attitudes towards one's creator. But despair is *also* caused by something other than these uneducated and regretful attitudes: The sufferings of despair are not only deserved but also *imposed*, so that »in a Promethean way, the ... self feels itself nailed to this servitude« (*SD* 70; *SV2* 11, 205); the self experiences the constraints of what creation has destined it to become. The fact

that despair is imposed prevents a person from fulfilling the requirement of becoming what he or she should become by virtue of creation, even if that should be desired. Despair has become a trap. This is the third aspect of despair, and the one most easily forgotten. To believe that the self is realizable through the powers of choice alone is an immature confusion »in dem die spätere Existenzphilosophie, jedenfalls die deutsche, oft hängengeblieben ist.«<sup>2</sup> Yet the unhappy paradox – that self-realization is both an impossibility and a requirement – reveals an escape: To hope against hope that what is now only possible could be actualized is the *miracle of the self*. For Kierkegaard, it is even illusory to postulate that *anything* could be real apart from the miracle of redemptive faith:

... the critical decision does not come until a person is brought to his extremity, when, humanly speaking, there is no possibility. Then the question is whether he will believe that for God everything is possible, that is, whether he will *believe* (SD 38; SV2 11, 170).

Because despair is partly imposed, a miraculous redemption of self involves the mystery that God can afford to burden creation through suffering and still preserve the status as sovereign redeemer from suffering. That despair should be a divinely imposed affliction is truly a disconcerting circumstance which requires that one must always be prepared to suffer. »The reason for this is that to despair is a qualification of spirit and relates to the eternal in man ... he cannot rid himself of the eternal – no, never in all eternity« (SD 17; SV2 11, 147). Despair is not simply a result of self-estrangement, or estrangement from God; nor is it neutralized by self-acceptance or restitution of the self's relationship to God. Rather, suffering is an inescapable component of one's relation to oneself (a relation that constitutes the self), even when the self has not deserved the suffering that happens to come its way: »For despair is not attributable to the misrelation but to the relation that relates itself to itself« (SD 17; SV2 11, 147). Kierkegaard's challenging contention is that suffering is part of existence and that consequently the human self is essentially hypothetical; it is essentially a *becoming*. A new challenge to overcome despair always lies in wait: »wirkliches Selbstsein ist keine 'erfüllte' Möglichkeit wie Wirklichkeit sonst; es ist bloss 'die zunichte gemachte Möglichkeit' der Verzweiflung.«<sup>3</sup>

The difficulty is that it still seems impossible for Kierkegaard to maintain the hypothetical self without also envisioning a »state of the self when despair is completely rooted out« (SD 14; SV2, 11, 145). How can the self

be defined by two contradictory, but coexisting, principles: that of always being on the way and that of being on the way towards completion? Struggling with this problem, Walter Schulz appropriates the principles of Christian incarnation and advances the theological response that because God has appeared in human form it is meaningless to seek escape from the constraints of that very form. God's incarnation in Christ is – in itself – an emancipation of finite existence; it is a reinstatement of the finite as finite. Therefore, human redemption is actualized by acknowledging that God's taking on human form is the ultimate affirmation of the human condition *as it is*: »um das Ewige zu erlangen, darf der Mensch nicht die Zeit überschreiten, sondern muss gerade in die Zeit hineingehen, weil in ihr allein das Ewige zu finden ist.«<sup>4</sup> The parallel between our human existence on one side, and God's appearance as a human being on the other, is taken to demonstrate that the entrapping reality of suffering should not be considered to be decisive. Schulz' suggestion must therefore imply that there is a certain illusory quality to the sufferings of despair: Realizing that God has affirmed humanity as it is, we »kann nun ohne Verzweiflung weiterleben.«<sup>5</sup> Suffering is remedied through recollection of the incarnation event – that is, by remembrance. In so far as despair is experienced as an entrapping and intruding reality over whose disruptive power the human being does not have ultimate control, Schulz' point also implies that there is a certain illusory quality to the reality of evil. The question is, however, to what extent Schulz' equation of the power of remembrance and the power of redemption is a viable response to the problem of evil. Attempting to formulate an answer to this question, we now turn to F.W.J. Schelling, particularly his wrestling with the German idealist notion of human subjectivity as it comes forth in his later philosophy.

## 2. Idealist Subjectivity Dismissed: The Powerlessness of Reason

According to Hegel, reality cannot be defined in terms of a separation between human rationality and the world; reality exists within human subjectivity as its rational thought movement. This definition of reality is a product of Hegel's philosophy and the prime principle of idealist thinking. It has served as the basis for many a theoretical response to the problem of devising a general explanatory principle to the unification of what many hold to be reality's two antithetical principles: the inevitability of complexity and the vision of unity. In the present context this problem is seen as a

parallel to Kierkegaard's paradoxical description of the self as essentially hypothetical *and* striving towards completion.

In accordance with Hegel, Schelling insists that all true philosophy is idealist philosophy. He agrees that reality is fundamentally rational and only comprehensible by means of rational reflection. Yet he is still provoked by the pretension that reason should be derived from itself, and he therefore charges Hegel with leaving reason to itself in an eternally restless circle of meaninglessness – like a worm incessantly eating its own tail, achieving neither life nor death. Schelling cannot but ask: »warum ist überhaupt etwas? warum ist nicht nichts?«<sup>6</sup> He realizes that »das Wissen den absoluten Erkenntnisakt nur reproduziert, als auch eine Begründung dafür geliefert, warum das Wissen *sich selbst als unhintergehbaren Anfang* behaupten muss.«<sup>7</sup> Reason cannot account for its own power and will have to concede that it must be defined in terms of *powerlessness*. In Schelling's description, then, reflection is a self-circulating but also self-transcending movement that advances beyond itself to a point where it encounters its own facticity and limitation: 'Erstarrt, quasi attonita,' reason is confronted by its own 'dasshafte Wesenlosigkeit,' the very fact that it *is*. The important point is that reason suddenly becomes more than a negated power as it realizes the fact that even *before* exercising its own power (which leads to its self-negation) it necessarily is negated reason. At the pinnacle of its capacity, reason materializes and is *thereby* authorized to be the thing it always was. Through an uncovering of the powerlessness of reason, reason is reinstated as reason.

This means that Schelling has managed to revoke the idealist vision of defining human subjectivity in terms of pure rationality alone: »In Schelling vollzieht sich erstmalig die Bewegung, in der die sich übersteigende Subjektivität in sich selbst zu kreisen beginnt.«<sup>8</sup> Or, redefining subjectivity in a more structural language: *Human subjectivity is a pre-established and self-affirming twofold movement of 'Aus-sich-herausgehens' and 'In-sich-zurückkehrens.'* With Schelling, the human subject has claimed the pre-rational nature of its own existence, and implicitly also brought closure to any further progress of idealist thought, since the future of its central category, human subjectivity, has come to a halt and can reach no next developmental level.

For Schelling, a reinstatement of reason as reason is the same as a revelation of God's reality. His God is the God of the philosophical system, the source and pure initiation of being. When compared with this God, reason is realized to be what it always has been, derived and negated being. This

also entails, for Schelling, that a philosophical system is possible *only* as a *per se* religious system, and that the discipline of speculative religious philosophy is sanctioned because reason can now be depended upon as a means of acquiring insight into God's metaphysical and eternal truths. Hence, rational philosophy has acknowledged the necessity of conceding that human subjectivity can no longer be defined apart from intimate relatedness to divine reality. Not in the way of a formal capitulation to the inevitable. Rather, a new urgency has been given to the task of formulating this relatedness in a manner that preserves the integrity of human freedom and divine freedom concurrently, and at the same time emphasizes the impossibility of analyzing the two in separation from each other. The point to be taken from Schelling is his paradoxical statement that the experience of ultimate powerlessness and the experience of ultimate freedom are two sides of the same coin; one does not exist without the other.

### 3. Human Freedom and the Source of Evil in God

On the heels of Schelling's validation of speculative religious philosophy follow the most original and controversial parts of his philosophy. Convinced that the world is a product of God's absolute freedom, Schelling is persuaded that actual world history is a direct empirical mirror of God's nature, and he therefore takes on the task of writing out the world history of mythology and revelation. This project is met by very high expectations on the part of those who now hope they have finally found a thinker to provide the arguments needed »um die Drachensaat des Hegelschen Pantheismus zu bekämpfen.«<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately, Schelling never arrives at a point where he can deal effectively with the anthropological aspects anticipated to be the culmination of his philosophical talent, and he ends up losing his way in the expanding labyrinths of his own speculative project. As Schelling's famous Berlin lectures on mythology and revelation increase in metaphysical obscurity they decrease in conceptual clearness, and the high hopes soon turn disappointed.

In my judgment, this disappointment is an indication of Schelling's inability to balance the intimate relatedness of human freedom and divine freedom in such a way that the integrity of both is preserved. Furthermore, I will argue that this inability is closely related to the way he responds to the theodicy problem. Qualifying this, it is necessary to introduce another philosopher, *Jakob Böhme*, who enjoyed a strong renaissance among German Romantics and therefore also plays a central role in Schelling's think-

ing. For my present purposes, his response to the theodicy problem is the point of special interest.

Schelling's defense of God's uncompromised sovereignty allows him to embrace Böhme's claim that evil must have its ontological origin in God and that it must be a real and positive part of God. In agreement with Böhme, Schelling argues that if this were not the case, it would be impossible to acknowledge genuine evil without granting it a restraining influence upon God's power. This leads Schelling to question the assumption that evil can be reconciled with any rationalist system that presumes the cohesion of all things. In a bold move, he directs this common idealist critique of pantheism against idealist thought itself: »alle Philosophie, schlechthin alle, die nur rein vernunftmässig ist, ist oder wird Spinozismus!«<sup>10</sup> He asserts that pantheism and idealism alike deprive the human subject of the freedom of self-determination; they are and remain fatalistic. Schelling's claim now is that the reality of evil within God is conditioned by human freedom, which he takes to be the cause of the emancipation of the irrational powers of darkness and evil originating within God. Arguing an ontological rootedness of evil in God, Schelling develops his doctrine of God's potencies and *makes human freedom account for the presence of evil as an independent – but subordinate – power of irrationality and darkness within God*. God has two opposing poles: necessity and freedom. God's necessity is subject to God's freedom and consists of three dynamically interrelated powers or potencies: Contraction, expansion and the unity of both. The first two potencies of God are defined as the opposing powers of darkness and light, evil and good, real and ideal. The third potency is the unity of these two antithetical potencies; that is, the spontaneous and continued transformation of the first potency of contraction into the second potency of expansion: »the eternal end of the process of alternation, the goal that is always present.«<sup>11</sup> God's potencies exhibit a double reality of unity and circular three-ness:

Jede dieser Mächte kann für sich seyn; denn die Einheit ist Einheit für sich, und jedes der Entgegengesetzten ist ganzes vollständiges Wesen; doch kann keines seyn, *ohne* dass die andern auch sind, denn nur zusammen erfüllen sie den ganzen Begriff der Gottheit.<sup>12</sup>

The three potencies necessarily order themselves in this mode of continued transformation and emerge in opposition to God's freedom and second pole, the highest principle of pure will within God, *purus actus*. Now, in the presence of God's freedom, the potencies intensely desire redemp-

tion from their compulsive and circular inter-relatedness, and only as they find themselves 'dynamically fixed' in subservience to God's freedom can they exist as an organic whole, »not something that 'happens' to or in God but ... an aspect of his eternal reality.«<sup>13</sup> It is the supremacy of God's freedom over God's necessity that establishes God's divine reality.

It is necessary to understand this rather complex description of God's inner life in order to see how Schelling can attribute absolute importance to human freedom in a preservation of God's sovereignty in the face of evil. The lead idea is that human subjectivity has mastery over God's potencies by virtue of its immediate and not-yet-self-conscious nature, i.e. »[e]r hat über sie Macht nur, wenn er sich nicht bewegt (keine aktuelle, sondern nur eine *magische Macht*).«<sup>14</sup> This means that human immediacy secures the harmony of God's potencies; it also means that human subjectivity has the capacity for spontaneously accepting its inferiority in comparison to the sovereignty of God and that it can perceive God and divine harmony intuitively. The fatal point is that when human subjectivity becomes aware of this harmony (established by its own subordination under God), it becomes self-conscious and the harmony is instantaneously disturbed. Suddenly the human subject has turned away from God. It has exercised its freedom and caused its own separation from God. The serious result is that the powers of irrationality and darkness are let loose, and that they leave the human subject with the task of fighting its way back towards the original harmony through a world infected by darkness, confusion and evil powers. But through this battle, it can re-gain the harmony that was lost and can do so *in a way that does not allow it to be lost a second time because subordination under God has been chosen in freedom* and because of the acknowledgment of the cost it entails to reject God's sovereignty. This entails that the kind of consciousness gained after this free acceptance of God's sovereignty is qualitatively superior to the kind of consciousness it replaces. In fact, human freedom – like divine freedom – is only really possible when God's freedom has *re-gained* its primacy since this establishes God's sovereignty on the basis of human self-consciousness. In the fallen human being, Schelling remarks, »ist der tiefste Abgrund und der höchste Himmel.«<sup>15</sup>

#### 4. The Sovereignty of God's Negative Presence

Schelling argues that because the fallen human being must win back its harmonious relatedness to divine reality through a battle against the powers of evil, human self-consciousness must be a process, or a becoming.

Accordingly, this process is the expression of God's historical movement through human consciousness which, seemingly, places Schelling in the company of Hegelian idealism. Still, there is a significant difference between the positions of Schelling and Hegel:

Schelling [wirft] Hegel vor, ... dass Hegel seinem Gott zusammen mit dem ungehemmten Drang zur Entäusserung den Abfall in eine aussergöttliche Welt zumutet. ... *Nicht weil er theistisch, sondern weil er als Deus absconditus interpretiert ist, hält sich der Schellingsche Gott vom Weltprozess frei.*<sup>16</sup>

In so far as God's freedom and pure will always have authority over God's necessity, God cannot possibly be exhausted through the course of history. God's freedom always retains an unrevealed aspect in addition to what is revealed by God. Therefore, it is necessary for Schelling to define God as *Deus absconditus*; and therefore it remains impossible for Hegel to subscribe to Schelling's God.

It is not the unreachable and hidden part of Schelling's God that makes God's presence negative. Rather, it is the human experience of suffering in the process of overcoming the forces of evil. Divine harmony in its immediate and first form is forever lost through the human fall into self-consciousness; but this harmony is still *negatively present as a vision* of something to be re-gained in a way that can secure its irrevocable and eternal reality. The significant thing is Schelling's way of preserving God's absolute sovereignty by means of the development of human self-consciousness through a successful process of defeating the powers of irrationality and evil. This is his response to the problem of evil, and evidence that he regards the human fall away from God as a positive, not a negative, event:

Gott in sich selbst betrachtet ist schlechterdings zweck- und sinnlos. Seinen Zweck und seinen Sinn kann er nur in einem Anderen finden ... das ausser ihm ist und doch wiederum nicht aus seiner Machtsphäre fällt ... das, indem es seinen *eigenen* Zweck erfüllt, zugleich, als aus Gott herausgesetzt, den 'Zweck Gottes' verwirklicht. Ein solches Anderes ist die geschaffene Kreatur.<sup>17</sup>

## 5. Powerlessness and Freedom

Recalling Kierkegaard's analyses of despair, his problem is to reconcile, on one side, the challenge of continually overcoming despair and, on the other,



the vision of reaching the point of complete defeat of despair. In Schulz' interpretation, Kierkegaard's solution is to acknowledge God's incarnation in Christ as God's *re-instatement* of human existence in its full ambiguity, i.e. as both inflicted by suffering and successfully defeating suffering. There is a striking parallel between this solution and the way Schelling makes the human subject's claim of its own pre-rational existence responsible for the closure of idealist thinking. Where Schelling insists on the *powerlessness of reason*, Kierkegaard echoes this insistence, but does so in terms of the *powerlessness of existence*: As human subjectivity encounters its own limitation and powerlessness in the trap of despair, the possibility of freedom and selfhood is revealed as a miracle of faith. Kierkegaard agrees with Schelling that the experience of ultimate powerlessness and the experience of ultimate freedom are necessarily co-existent, and that understanding the inter-relatedness of human subjectivity and divine reality is only possible on the basis of this paradox. Referring back to Schelling's redefinition of human subjectivity, our conclusion shall now be that *both* Kierkegaard and Schelling can be said to define human subjectivity as a *pre-established and self-affirming twofold movement of 'Aus-sich-herausgehens' and 'In-sich-zurückkehrens.'*<sup>18</sup>

In spite of this structural agreement between Kierkegaard and Schelling, a significant discrepancy between the two lurks. On Schelling's account, human subjectivity is qualified as a reliable source of knowledge about God because of the arduous process it goes through in overcoming the evil consequences of its own fall into separation from God. As already indicated, it is problematic that Schelling's affirmation of God's negative presence in the world results in an annexation of human subjectivity in relation to divine reality in the form of very narrow and speculative analyses of God's divine nature and metaphysical truth. These analyses seem to become his one preoccupation and goal, at the cost of *integrating* human subjectivity and divine reality, or human freedom and divine freedom: Schelling places an emphasis on the freedom of God at the expense of granting equal weight to the freedom of human subjectivity, the latter of which is, in the first place, the very means of access to knowledge about divine reality.

As for Kierkegaard, his initial loyalty to a strong anti-subjectivist defense of God's sovereignty paradoxically enough occasions an even more loyal commitment to analyzing the inner dynamics of human subjectivity. The hope against hope that God will miraculously redeem the self from despair is so strongly defined by the human experience of despair that, at the expense of discussing God's nature and redemptive purpose,

Kierkegaard's focus narrows to an almost exclusive emphasis on the complex dynamics of human nature.

What we are left with is a discrepancy between Schelling and Kierkegaard that can be described as follows: Where Schelling annexes human subjectivity in relation to divine reality, the reverse happens for Kierkegaard, who annexes divine reality in relation to human subjectivity. Schelling's inability to concurrently balance human freedom and divine freedom is closely related to the way he responds to the theodicy problem. This is also the case with Kierkegaard. The question is how this shared inability ties in with the theodicy problem.

## 6. The Theodicy Problem

As noted, and contrary to Schulz' interpretation of Kierkegaard's analyses of despair, it remains a question to what extent equating the power of remembrance with the power of redemption is a viable solution to the theodicy problem. In order to establish a frame of reference for a discussion of this question, I have chosen to introduce some elements from classical Christian responses to the theodicy problem.

The Christian tradition has recognized the power of evil as destructive of God's creation. But, as powerful as it is, evil can only destroy; it cannot create, or even re-create what it has destroyed. In fact, if a desire for recreation or reconstruction should announce itself, there simply is no capacity in evil for the realization of such a desire; only reliance on what is good can empower any kind of restoration, or redemption from destructive influences. Reliance on good, as opposed to evil, is therefore reliance on the power of creation in the form it assumes as the power of redemption. On this account, the power of redemption has its source in God who is the original creator of everything that has existence and being, who is only goodness and light, and who conceals no manner of darkness. This is thought to explain why evil, although it has the power to inflict inexpressible pain and suffering, still remains empty, insubstantial and disconnected from any source of being. Evil only knows how to destroy the goodness of the substantiality it lacks for itself; it is therefore something from which one must be protected, but it is also something from which one must be redeemed when the shield of protection has been penetrated.

The opposition of animosity between the powers of good and evil easily translates into a dualist world view and an equation of these two powers. But, along the lines of the Christian tradition, mere power does not

establish the ultimate outcome of the battle between good and evil. Substantiality, or goodness, does. For while a pursuit of the good leads to the restoration of a creation that was harmed by evil, a pursuit of evil solidifies the transformation of substantiality into insubstantiality, or emptiness. This transformation is conditioned by the destructive influence of evil, but its solidification does not occur by means of gradual evaporation and disappearance of substantiality; rather – and this aspect brings our discussion back to Kierkegaard – by culminating in the most radical loss of all: Absolute emptiness and the ultimate suffering of having no hope in the source from which one can receive one's self. This experience of emptiness is the self realizing the impossibility of annulling its own urge for self-fulfillment. Indeed, the most excruciating of all forms of suffering must be the entrapment in a despair that desires to be free of the task of becoming what one is created to be – but is not granted that freedom. Emptiness is then experienced as suffering under the weight of an imposed destination one has never aspired to reach; and therefore the experience is one of receiving a punishment one has never deserved. This punishment is not so much the imposed destination of having to become what some independent source of creation has determined, as much as it is the imposed destination of finding absolutely no dispensation from the principles of creation and redemption. Ultimate death can be desired, but it cannot be executed:

Thus to be sick *unto* death is to be unable to die, yet not as if there were hope of life; no, the hopelessness is that there is not even the ultimate hope, death. ... then despair is the hopelessness of not even being able to die (*SD* 18; *SV* 2 11, 148).

## 7. Some Observations about the Life of Becoming

Both Schelling and Kierkegaard affirm that human subjectivity finds itself shaped by its struggle with the reality of suffering and consequently cannot escape going through a developmental process that heightens its awareness of divine reality as well as its awareness of itself as essentially *becoming*.

Although Schelling shows a strong awareness of the self as becoming, his firm emphasis on this aspect gradually transforms the becoming of self into the becoming of God; earlier, this was termed an annexation of human subjectivity in relation to divine reality. In comparison, Kierkegaard's sense of the self's developmental journey of becoming is not as pronounced insofar as the entrapping and imposed nature of despair sig-

nificantly tempers his confidence in the proficiency of pressing forward through suffering.

The important observation is that Kierkegaard's annexation of divine reality and his narrow focus on the human experience of despair eventually takes the surprising turn of defining ultimate despair as a loss of hope for *death*, not a loss of hope for life. The problem is not that life challenges the self to the point of infliction, but that escaping these sufferings through death is not an available option. In my judgment, this reveals an even stronger, albeit *indirect*, affirmation of the developmental nature of the self than we have seen argued by Schelling. Unexpectedly, the notion of ultimate loss of hope discloses itself as an impossibility for Kierkegaard in so far as hope, *per se*, proves indestructible: Hope is a principle of creation, and the principles of creation, redemption and becoming can be reversed, but they cannot be cancelled. For at the end of a reversed process of becoming, the suffering of unwanted emptiness awaits; one discovers the consummation of the structure of evil – not the freedom of ultimate death.

## Notes

1. Søren Kierkegaard, *The Sickness Unto Death: A Christian Psychological Exposition for Upbuilding and Awakening*, trans. Howard V. Hong & Edna H. Hong, 1980 (SD), in *Kierkegaard's Writings*, I-XXV, ed. H.V. Hong & E.H. Hong, Princeton, Princeton University Press. References to the Danish edition, *Samlede Værker*, 2. ed., ed. A.B. Drachmann, J.L. Heiberg & H.O. Lange, Copenhagen, Gyldendalske Boghandel/Nordisk Forlag, 1920-36 (SV2).
2. Michael Theunissen, »Kierkegaards philosophisches Profil,« *Kierkegaardiana* 18, 1996, pp. 6-27, p. 14.
3. Michael Theunissen, *Das Selbst auf dem Grund der Verzweigung: Kierkegaards negativistische Methode*, Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Anton Hain, 1991, p. 54.
4. Walter Schulz, *Johann Gottlieb Fichte: Vernunft und Freiheit. Søren Kierkegaard: Existenz und System*, Pfullingen, Verlag Günther Neske, 1977, p. 64.
5. Walter Schulz, *Die Völlendung des Deutschen Idealismus in der Spätphilosophie Schellings*, Pfullingen, Verlag Günther Neske, 1975, p. 278.
6. F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophie der Offenbarung*, 1858, in *Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schellings sämtliche Werke*, 14 vols., ed. K.F.A. Schelling, Stuttgart & Augsburg, J.G. Cotta'scher Verlag, 1856-1861, vol. 13, p. 7.
7. Manfred Frank, *Der unendliche Mangel an Sein: Schellings Hegelkritik und die Anfänge der Marxschen Dialektik*, München, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1992, p. 215. Italics mine.
8. Schulz, *Die Völlendung des Deutschen Idealismus*, p. 272.
9. Walter Schulz, »Freiheit und Geschichte in Schellings Philosophie,« in F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit*, Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1975, p. 23.
10. F.W.J. Schelling, *Über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit*, Stuttgart, Philipp Reclam jun., 1995, p. 59.
11. Robert F. Brown, *The Later Philosophy of Schelling: The Influence of Boehme on the Works of 1809-1815*, Cranbury/London, Associated University Presses, 1977, p. 208.
12. F.W.J. Schelling, *Die Weltalter*, 1861, in *Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schellings sämtliche Werke*, 14 vols., ed. K.F.A. Schelling, Stuttgart & Augsburg, J.G. Cotta'scher verlag, 1856-1861, vol. 8, p. 217.
13. Brown, *The Later Philosophy of Schelling*, p. 214.
14. Schelling, *Philosophie der Offenbarung*, p. 349. Italics mine.
15. Schelling, *Über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit*, 1995, p. 77.
16. Michael Theunissen, »Die Dialektik der Offenbarung: Zur Auseinandersetzung Schellings und Kierkegaards mit der Religionsphilosophie Hegels,« *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 72, ed. Max Müller, Freiburg/München, Verlag Karl Alber, 1964, pp. 134-160, p. 147. Italics mine.
17. Schulz, *Die Völlendung des Deutschen Idealismus*, p. 233.
18. Comparing Schelling and Kierkegaard, Schulz advances this point among the final conclusions of *Die Völlendung des Deutschen Idealismus*.