



**k a b i r i**

The Official Journal of the  
*North American  
Schelling Society*

NEW COMMENTED TRANSLATION

## Schelling's Literary Estate

---

Nora Angleys, Thomas Buchheim, and Fritz Engel<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Biographical Context

Since 1849, albeit intermittently, Schelling had been working on writing a testament. This testament did not manage his personal estate but was an “Overview of What Will Be My Literary Estate,” determining which of his unpublished manuscripts were to be published and in what way. Among these unpublished manuscripts were some of the earliest writings from his studies; they were *mainly* middle, later, and latest works, however, as he had not published anything of greater conspicuity since the *Freedom Essay* (bibl. 25) in 1809 (with few exceptions, such as the polemic work against Jacobi, *F.W.J. Schelling's Monument to Jacobi's Work on the Divine Things* [*F.W.J. Schellings Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen etc. des Herrn Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi*, 1812] and the treatise *On the Deities of Samothrace* [*Über die Gottheiten von Samothrake*, 1815]).

In a letter dating from 12 February 1849 to the Kiel historian Georg Waitz, the husband of his daughter Clara, Schelling wrote about the “struggle

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank Iris Simon, for her meticulous and committed support for compiling the editorial information, as well as Carlos Zorrilla Piña, for valuable contributions and fruitful discussions about this publication, which was written as part of the research project “Schellings unvollendetes System” (Schelling's Incomplete System | project number: 464064048), funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation).

[...] to lay down one's scientific and literary testament, on which I am working with all my force."<sup>1</sup> Letters from years following make further reference to this intention of bringing order to his estate. A letter to his son Karl Friedrich August Schelling (K.F.A.) from 24 July 1851, for example, reads: "Pray, that I may complete my work and bring some structure to my scientific estate."<sup>2</sup> This statement already suggests that for Schelling there is an important connection between structuring his literary estate and the completion of his final work *Philosophical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology or Presentation of the Purely Rational Philosophy* (*Philosophische Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie oder Darstellung der reinrationalen Philosophie*) (DRP, bibl. 4). Finally, on 20 February 1853, just before finishing<sup>3</sup> the testament, he writes in his calendar: "continued work on registering my literary estate, which took more time than expected."<sup>4</sup>

Schelling worried that his sons would not publish his latest—albeit insufficiently communicated and not yet fully matured—philosophical ideas as their father's final philosophy, but would instead present to the public a system with which *they* were familiar and that *they* deemed to be well-rounded, but one that Schelling himself considered to be outdated. This explains why bringing structure to his literary estate was so important to him.

Schelling had become more isolated in his philosophical workings. In the winter semester 1845/46—by then Schelling was seventy years old—only a small audience (reportedly no more than 29 listeners)<sup>5</sup> followed his last course: the main sections of the *Philosophy of Mythology* as found in *Schelling's collected works* (*Sämmtliche Werke*).<sup>6</sup> Contrast this with his inaugural lecture in Berlin, in winter 1841/42, on the reworked course on the philosophy of revelation, which was highly anticipated. The university's largest lecture hall was packed<sup>7</sup> not only with students but with the entire intellectual elite of the time, which had pointedly gathered to see him.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gustav Leopold Plitt, ed., *Aus Schellings Leben: in Briefen*, Vol. 3. (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1869–1870), 214.

<sup>2</sup> Plitt, *Aus Schellings Leben* III, 231.

<sup>3</sup> The literary estate is dated "February 1853."

<sup>4</sup> *Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften – Archiv*. [= *BBAW-A-Schelling*], Nr.74 [= *Calendar 1853*], 8. For information about where to find the manuscripts of the late (unpublished) calendars, see bibl. *Manuscripts*.

<sup>5</sup> Olaf Briese, "In einem freisinnigen Geiste.' Schellings Auftreten in Berlin im Licht neu erschlossener Zeugnisse," in *Berlin in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Jahrbuch des Landesarchivs Berlin* 1995, ed. Jürgen Wetzel, 85–97 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1995), 95.

<sup>6</sup> *Schelling's collected works*, ed. Karl Friedrich August Schelling. 14 vols. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'scher Verlag, 1856–1861. [= SW]

<sup>7</sup> In the anonymously published text, Engels writes of "almost four hundred people, of all social positions and nations." (Friedrich Engels, "Schelling and Revelation: Critique of the Latest Attempt of Reaction Against the Free Philosophy," in *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 2. (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, 189–240), 200.)



Expectations, however, were severely disappointed<sup>8</sup> over the course of that semester; the negative reception resounded so strongly in letters, news, and by word of mouth that Schelling must have known about it. Shortly after the end of the semester, numerous pamphlets against Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation* emerged,<sup>9</sup> condemning it as too Christian and therefore old-fashioned. Among them was a very clever critique by Friedrich Engels<sup>10</sup> as well as a preposterous, meticulously-crafted transcript—supplemented with hostile commentary by his former friend, the theologian H.G.E. Paulus—which was deeply offensive to Schelling (see bibl. 17). Schelling sought legal remedies against the unauthorized publication by Paulus<sup>11</sup> of a transcript by a group of Young Hegelians,<sup>12</sup> but he ultimately lost in court,<sup>13</sup> which further angered him and contributed to his abandoning public lecturing altogether.

In the summer of 1842, Schelling attempted to vindicate his philosophy by reworking and improving his new introduction to the Berlin version of the *Philosophy of Revelation*, focusing on the two types of philosophy (positive and negative) and, so he hoped, explaining their relation to each other more clearly. This lecture—the *Berlin Introduction to the Philosophy of Revelation* (*Berliner Einleitung in die Philosophie der Offenbarung*<sup>14</sup>) (BI, bibl. 2)—which he

<sup>8</sup> For more information on these expectations, see Briese, *Schellings Auftreten in Berlin*.

<sup>9</sup> E.g., Karl Rosenkranz, *Schelling, Vorlesungen, gehalten im Sommer 1842 an der Universität zu Königsberg* (Danzig: Gerhard, 1843); and Philipp Marheineke, *Zur Kritik der Schellingschen Offenbarungsphilosophie. Schluß der öffentlichen Vorlesungen über die Bedeutung der Hegelschen Philosophie in der christlichen Theologie* (Berlin: Enslin, 1843).

<sup>10</sup> Engels, “Schelling and Revelation.” There is a second pamphlet by Engels, also published anonymously in 1842: “Schelling der Philosoph in Christo, oder die Verklärung der Weltweisheit zur Gottesweisheit für gläubige Christen, denen der philosophische Sprachgebrauch unbekannt ist,” in *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 2. (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2010), 315–339.

<sup>11</sup> Paulus did not write the transcript himself but bought it as a booklet. Xavier Tilliette, ed., *Schelling im Spiegel seiner Zeitgenossen I* (Turin: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1974), refers to Rosenkranz (477 and 487); see also the “Introduction” by Manfred Frank, in F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophie der Offenbarung 1841/42*, ed. Manfred Frank (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977) [based on the transcript by Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus], 48 (= *Paulus transcript*); and Xavier Tilliette, *Schelling: Biographie*, trans. Susanne Schaper, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2004), 418. Another theory is that Paulus did not merely buy the booklet, but he paid someone to take notes of the lecture (see Tilliette, *Schelling im Spiegel*, 405 and n1345).

<sup>12</sup> In Briese, *Schellings Auftreten in Berlin*, 95n83 refers to a letter by Conrad Philipp Marheineke to H.G.E Paulus dated 29 November 1842, which mentions the dissemination of the transcript (Universitätsbibliothek der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, autograph No. 678). Cf. bibl. *Manuscripts*.

<sup>13</sup> See Tilliette, *Schelling im Spiegel*, 419.

<sup>14</sup> The title is what Schelling used in his testament for this lecture, which he worked on from summer until autumn 1842, and read in the following winter semester for the first time (see bibl. 2). The published English version is F.W.J. Schelling, *The Grounding of Positive Philosophy: The Berlin Lectures*, trans. Bruce Matthews (Albany: SUNY Press, 2008).

delivered for the first time<sup>15</sup> in winter 1842/43, is a relatively comprehensible and philosophically mature text reflecting the status quo of his philosophy at the time. It is, to-date, among the most prominent texts of Schelling's overall unapproachable late philosophy, and it still dominates the reception of Schelling's latest philosophical system, if we do not take into account Schelling's *last* revision-phase from about three years later (1846) until his death—a phase during which he explicitly distanced himself from the path and concepts he had set forth in BI. Schelling, however, upheld this revision in several places: He considered the BI not to be a part of the authorized concepts and thoughts of his latest revised philosophy, and, consequently, he did not want it published as a part of his final system.<sup>16</sup>

In fact, Schelling's latest revision resulted, strictly speaking, not in *one* system but rather in a kind of *systematic architecture*. We use the term “architecture” to emphasize that Schelling's latest philosophy is not one “system” in the conventional sense: It does not develop from and along conceptual necessities. Rather, his latest philosophy is based on the idea that two systems, each of a fundamentally different structure<sup>17</sup>—with their own methodologies and *without* an uninterrupted, internal transition between them—can be brought together as one philosophy through this complex “architecture.” Nevertheless, this philosophy is distinctly and intentionally structured *around* a principle. This fundamentally different final architecture was the result of a far-reaching and extensive revision phase, one that had only begun after Schelling had withdrawn from public life at the university. The revision involved rearranging parts of his former philosophical system, most importantly the *Philosophy of Mythology* (MYL) and the *Philosophy of Revelation* (PO; bibl. 16 and 17 respectively), into a distinct new order of five books.<sup>18</sup> The revision in general, and in particular the philosophical legitimation of the resulting book-order, was never recognized, let alone understood—not by Schelling's peers and not even by his closest circle of friends, family, and followers.<sup>19</sup> Consequently, the publication of Schelling's late work in section II of *Schelling's collected works*, primarily by his second son, K.F.A., is based on an

---

<sup>15</sup> He read another, reviewed and supplemented, version in the summer semester 1844 (see bibl. 2).

<sup>16</sup> According to his testament, he considered BI to be “worthy of stand-alone publication” at most (see below).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. BI, SW XIII: 133.

<sup>18</sup> See the dictation to the oldest son, Paul, from 1852 (*Appendix*) and also the newly published testament on the publishing of Schelling's literary estate.

<sup>19</sup> Schelling wrote to his old friend and former pupil Gotthilf Heinrich von Schubert on 30 June 1850: “You shouldn't have [sc. sent a birthday letter to Schelling], as my affection for you does not hinge on you demonstrating yours; for me, however, as I am inching closer to the completion of my work and thereby becoming ever more lonely, it hurts to be deemed a dead man for my dearest, loyal, and old friends” (Plitt, *Aus Schellings Leben* III, 226).

understanding<sup>20</sup> that corresponded to the aforementioned *Philosophy of Revelation* from 1841/42—the one with such poor public reception—along with the subsequently-written and -reviewed introduction from 1842/43 (BI).

It is hence that *Schelling's collected works*, rather unintentionally, obscured his latest and key conceptual revisions—which revisions have remained inaccessible to his readership until today. Particularly noteworthy is the *Presentation of the Purely Rational Philosophy* (DRP), which was posthumously completed and ultimately edited by Schelling's son K.F.A.,<sup>21</sup> and which found its way into *Schelling's collected works*; but, due to its intricate character, does not immediately let Schelling's revisions come to light. Interestingly, instead of being used as proof and justification for the total exclusion of this very introduction from the newly arranged architecture, the DRP, particularly where it departs from the old system, has generally been interpreted in line with BI, a text from *before* the final revision. This skewed reception, from the outset, adds to the difficulty of understanding the DRP today.

For Schelling, the DRP is *key* to understanding the revision, as it was new in important ways, with significant consequences for the order and status of those texts that belong to his latest philosophy. In fact, the entirety of Schelling's latest philosophy lacks systematic character without the DRP.<sup>22</sup> Schelling, however, realized, already while working on the DRP—which he began in 1846—that his peers would not be able to grasp properly the magnitude of this latest revision. This is why he was adamant not only to complete this work, but to establish its final role and function. Fully aware of the likelihood of his dying before achieving this goal, he laid down detailed and definitive instructions in his testament.

## 2. General Overview of the Testament

The testament is titled “Overview of What Will Be My Literary Estate,” dated February 1853, and signed by Schelling. His intention was not merely to list his manuscripts, but to shape them into his philosophical legacy, centered around the above-mentioned latest systematic architecture. And, should he

---

<sup>20</sup> See e.g., K.F.A.'s very long introduction to the *Philosophy of Revelation* (SW XIII) as well as correspondences between the siblings and close family members on the overall publication process.

<sup>21</sup> The end of the 23rd lecture (SW XI: 550–552) and the entire 24th lecture were compiled by K.F.A. from the folio sheet with “notes for my own use” (see below) that he found on Schelling's desk—following specific instructions given by Schelling before the latter's death. For further details and contextualization of the editorial editions, see Thomas Buchheim, “Schellings ‘Unvollendete’. Die Darstellung der reinrationalen Philosophie und ihr fragwürdiges Ende in der 24. Vorlesung,” *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 132 (2025): 3–21.

<sup>22</sup> “the publication of everything else was suspended until the completion of this text” (SW XI: vii) [= DRP].

have been unable to finish his work, the testament gives instructions about which manuscripts and partial manuscripts were to be included in his latest philosophy and published as such, and—just as importantly—which ones were to be excluded. This process of careful selection was especially extensive for the *Philosophy of Mythology* and the *Philosophy of Revelation*, as Schelling had delivered those lectures in several iterations under the same titles since the end of the 1820s in Munich, annotating and correcting existing versions and having some of the older ones transcribed or copied.

This practice resulted in multiple significantly different versions—with completely new additions to some of the existing manuscripts—which made it ever more important to determine the *correct* drafts and passages for publication. In making such determinations, Schelling wanted to ensure that the structure of his latest philosophical work was the one he ultimately believed to be fitting, rather than one reflecting older aspects of his philosophy, which he, again, deemed to be outdated: Schelling’s latest insights were not merely *extensions* but rather far-reaching *revisions*. Hence, as we know from his late calendars,<sup>23</sup> he worked on the manuscripts continuously until the year of his death.<sup>24</sup>

In the same vein, Schelling included in the testament instructions and word-for-word transitions between the individual works of his latest architecture—notably on how to interpret the DRP and the *Source(s) of Eternal Truths* (*Quelle der ewigen Wahrheiten*) (QEW, bibl. 4.1)<sup>25</sup> as well as *The Monotheism* (MOT, bibl. 14). He detailed not only an understanding of those texts, but he explained their *integration into* and *consequences for* the overall systematic

---

<sup>23</sup> Schelling continued to keep calendars (journals) after he moved to Berlin in 1841. The calendars for the years 1846, 1848, and 1849 are published at Meiner (bibl. 18). Frommann-Holzboog had planned the edition of the calendars 1842–54; however, they remain unpublished (for more information, see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

<sup>24</sup> In the calendar from the year he died, Schelling wrote, on 11 January: “Reviewed all earlier lectures from Berlin:  $\frac{B}{O}$ ,  $\frac{B}{EO}$  and later  $\frac{B}{+}$ ”; and the next day, he “proceeded as on the 11. (with  $\frac{B}{EO}$ ).” (Manuscript: *BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr. 75 [= *Calendar 1854*].) We can therefore assume that throughout these manuscripts there are sections that are a coalescence of older passages and later additions and corrections. This arrangement requires particular attention, careful comparison, and interpretation of the conceptually crucial aspects.

<sup>25</sup> Presented to the Berlin Academy of Sciences in January 1850 and included in *Schelling’s collected works* (SW XI: 575–590). In the testament, Schelling uses the title *Sources of Eternal Truths*, i.e., in the plural. The published version uses the singular *Source*.

architecture.<sup>26</sup> Even for those who have studied and are familiar with the latest Schelling, these provisions are often surprising and generally difficult. Interestingly, to-date, no attempt has been made critically to map the testament's provisions onto the writings of the second section of *Schelling's collected works*, and thereby to highlight the important deviations with respect to the revised latest philosophy.

**The “overview” of the literary estate contains six parts:**

- (I) Unpublished “older” manuscripts up until Schelling’s Würzburg time, in particular his *Philosophy of Art* and the *System of Philosophy in General* from 1804.
- (II) “Newer” manuscripts until the mid-20s, most prominently the *Ages of the World*, *Stuttgart Private Lectures*, and *Erlangen Lectures*.
- (III) The longest section of the testament, titled “newest,” is on the manuscripts for the *Philosophy of Mythology* and *Philosophy of Revelation*. Furthermore, the section lists additional manuscripts, which were prepared (Munich) or were written during this cycle (Berlin). They are subsumed under the subtitle “on the system of philosophy.”
- (IV) Several manuscripts from across different times, containing, among others, the dialogue *Clara*.
- (V) Several texts, which Schelling labels “separately stored manuscripts”: manuscripts from his university days, private calendars, and notebooks, all of which may be used within the family or for preparing publications.
- (VI) Concluding remarks to his sons and family, in general addressing the imposition of managing his estate; furthermore, Schelling leaves “all correspondences” to his family. He furthermore instructs the lectures to the Berlin Academy to be copied and printed immediately thereafter. For reasons later explained, however, his sons did not comply.

Schelling clearly instructs the destruction of some of the manuscripts—once everything that can be used in the context of his latest philosophy has been extracted. Fortunately for us, in some important cases, the sons did not follow said instructions (such as with the Würzburg *System of Philosophy* or the *Erlangen Lectures*). On the other hand, all important manuscripts from Berlin

---

<sup>26</sup> Again, according to Schelling, we are decidedly not talking about *one* philosophical system, but rather an architecture of five steps. Furthermore, the term “system” applies in two fundamentally different ways to undertakings *within* this architecture (cf. BI, SW XIII: 133), a passage that we know to be added later by Schelling’s own hand to the manuscript written by Stort, as the two different handwritings are clearly distinguishable in the original manuscript (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 106 [also referred to as *Stort’sche Abschrift*], 248; see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

(except for the *Berlin Introduction to the Philosophy of Revelation*), as well as all older fragments contributing to those Berlin lectures, were destroyed after the publication of the second section of *Schelling's collected works*, making any critical edition of those texts impossible. It is, however, still possible to undertake a *critical assessment* of their philosophical content against the backdrop of the entirety of still-available documents surrounding Schelling's latest revision—most instructive among which are the testament and a dictation to Paul (*Appendix*) documenting Schelling's envisioned architecture at the time (1852).

### 3. Assessment of the Different Editions of the Testament

The provided English translation<sup>27</sup> is based on a different transcript than the one used for publication by Horst Fuhrmans in 1959 in *Kant-Studien* (Vol. 51). The transcript chosen here for translation from the Schelling archive in Berlin<sup>28</sup> is significantly more detailed and in relevant places more accurate and truer to the material Schelling left behind. Where relevant, deviations from the version published by Fuhrmans are listed in the footnotes. This transcript was reviewed and corrected by a clearly well-informed person: immediately during its copying or shortly thereafter. This is evident, for example, in places where a first hand (using ink) left some blank spaces, which were then later filled in by a second hand with pencil. Additionally, the same second hand added a number of corrections and annotations to the transcript, which suggest<sup>29</sup> that the second hand is an editor well familiar with Schelling's writings, most likely

---

<sup>27</sup> Schelling's handwriting, especially in his older years, was virtually indecipherable; only a few, mainly family members, could read it. They made several copies of the testament and stored them separately. The original manuscript written by Schelling himself seems to be lost. The transcript used by Fuhrmans was made by Schelling's second daughter, Clara Waitz, and was, at the time, in possession of Emmy Waitz in Bielefeld. Another transcript, more like the one made by Clara Waitz, albeit copied less meticulously, can be found in the archive of the university library in Munich under the title "autograph No. 29." (For more information, see bibl. *Manuscripts*.) This could be another, later copy of the transcript made by Clara Waitz. Unfortunately, the original of the transcript made by Clara Waitz could not be obtained, and comparisons could only be made to the edited version by Fuhrmans. Where Fuhrmans's edition of the testament differs from the here-offered translation of Schelling's testament, Fuhrmans's version is acknowledged in the footnotes as "Fuhrmans."<sup>28</sup> Labeled by the archive with pencil, "1 and 2376," each circled. (*BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr.13/1; see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

<sup>29</sup> In two places we find the comment "leave space somewhere"—in order, perhaps, to allow for supplementing passages from other manuscripts described in the testament during preparation of the edition of the collected works.

K.F.A.<sup>30</sup> The handwriting in ink shows tidy, steady penmanship, which we believe to be not identical with K.F.A.’s<sup>31</sup> handwriting, but similar to the handwriting of Schelling’s son-in-law, Ulrich von Zech—albeit somewhat more sinuous. Ulrich had frequently been asked by the late Schelling to make copies of his rather illegible manuscripts. The second hand, noted on page 1 of the testament (albeit difficult to read) in pencil: “Ulrich | Cott(a) | 1853.”

It must be emphasized that the second hand consistently made quite relevant corrections and additions. For instance, all “+”-signs, where they stand for *positive* in terms of a “positive” philosophy, were replaced with the word *positive* written out. In the one passage, where the + sign does *not definitively* equate to “positive” philosophy, it remained unchanged.<sup>32</sup> Again, this suggests a great deal of familiarity with the existing manuscripts and Schelling’s philosophical habits—a familiarity the first hand seems to have lacked.

#### 4. Methodology

Schelling’s testament and the 1852 dictation are two of the few scarcely known documents in which Schelling explicitly lays out his vision for what is to be his philosophical legacy—which he considers to be the only viable attempt at a post-Kantian metaphysics. Importantly, and as these documents show, Schelling believed that achieving this goal would require his philosophy to be substantially expanded and fundamentally revised. Schelling left a plethora of texts, manuscripts, and correspondences reflecting his continuous work on

---

<sup>30</sup> On 8 July 1855, K.F.A., then in Weinsberg, working on finalizing the edition of the first volume of Schelling’s incomplete late philosophy (SW XI: *Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*), wrote to his brother Hermann in Berlin (letter: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Ana 608.B.III., see bibl. *Manuscripts*): “Please send as quickly as possible the Promemoria, which I left in Gotha, and requested it be sent to me, and from where I was informed that Ulrich had given it to you so you could give it to me. I need it for the end.” “The end” in the letter refers to the end of the important 24th lecture of the DRP, for which Schelling gave detailed instructions and even dictated word-for-word passages in his testament, which here is referred to as “Promemoria.” Ulrich (i.e., Ulrich von Zech, husband of Schelling’s daughter Caroline), who lived in Gotha, is named as sender of the testament, which suggests that he had written the relevant copy K.F.A. is asking for in his letter.

<sup>31</sup> See previous footnote (for a contrary position cf. Anna-Lena Müller-Bergen (with contributions by Simone Egidio Sartori), “Karl Friedrich August Schelling und ‘die Feder des seligen Vaters’: Editionsgeschichte und Systemarchitektur der zweiten Abteilung von F.W.J. Schellings ‘Sämmtlichen Werken’” in *Internationales Jahrbuch für Editions-wissenschaft* 21 (2007): 110–132, 115n25). The autographs we know to be K.F.A.’s never have an upward line on the letter “s” at the end of a word, only a downward line.

<sup>32</sup> This refers to the manuscript  $\frac{B}{+}$ , which we know to be the manuscript for the Berlin lecture on “The Principles of Philosophy” (winter semester 1843/44) and from which the fragment *Presentation of the Natural Process* (*Darstellung des Naturprocesses*) was taken and published in the 10th volume of the first section of *Schelling’s collected works*.

this project. The way in which the testament carefully selects individual manuscripts for what is to be his legacy reflects his desire to mold these iterations into a philosophically valid systematic architecture.

We believe the following three insights to be indicative of his intended ultimate architecture:

1) A philosophy of pure reason (what Schelling calls *negative philosophy*) brought to its end, as the second step of an introduction into post-critical metaphysics, can only leave us with the certainty that it is *not impossible* that there can be a single principle of all ontic being (*Seiendes*). Importantly, not only of ideal ontic being, but also of actual being in the “altered” (SW XI: 571), i.e., non-ideal, historical world.

2) Not only is it “not impossible,” but, when we look at human history as a whole, we find that the name “only God” and its intended concept, a concept that monotheistic religion had always claimed as a *central dogma* and called by this very name, corresponds to this possible principle.

3) Additionally, a philosophical investigation into the history of religions, beginning with the earliest mythologies, reveals that despite the unfathomable diversity of religions in the world, they all factually exist *as part of one* theogonic process in human consciousness, and their succession within this process is not merely contingent.

Hence, the fact that we can recognize this theogonic process in the historical occurrences of religion (one of the tasks of *positive philosophy*) can provide us with more rational grounds for the existence of God as monotheistic religions have taught and worshiped Him than for His non-existence. Schelling’s latest revision, once again, fundamentally changed not only the scope of negative and positive philosophy, but also their relation to each other, which required a completely new movement from one to the other.

These latest insights, and their increasing complexity as a result of Schelling’s further reflections on Kant’s critical philosophy, are what Schelling’s son and editor K.F.A. did not grasp in their full extension and philosophic significance. This led the latter to ignore some of the explicit instructions in the testament. Consequently, the publication of *Schelling’s collected works* obscures the above-mentioned architecture. The task of evaluating the testament cannot, therefore, rely on now-typical notions of what comprises Schelling’s latest philosophy, but must rather take into account the specific instructions that Schelling himself left, especially where they diverge from his earlier systematic conceptions.

As the explanations given above illustrate, Schelling’s latest thinking—for access to which the testament is indispensable, representing as it does a culmination of that thinking’s complexity—is hidden under multiple layers: philosophical insights, publication plans, correspondences, editorial decisions by Schelling and others, and, where impossible to ignore, even personal

motives. Where feasible, this translation with commentary attempts to identify, separate, and contextualize these layers. This also requires highlighting where and why the edition diverges from Schelling's specific instructions and, consequently, why and how existing interpretations of his work partially run counter to his intentions—until today. This interpretive difficulty results in sometimes complex or surprising findings that can be understood properly only in the context of Schelling's latest revision as a whole.

The English translation of the testament's sections (I), (II), and (IV)–(VI) is published here for the first time, but it is rather sparsely commented. Additionally, we have compiled a list of relevant publications of the texts mentioned in the testament, with existing translations, under *Editorial Information*. The numbers in the editorial information correspond to numbers in the bibliography. Section (III), however, which discusses Schelling's "latest" works (i.e., the entire late philosophy) is portioned into 11 smaller sections (III.a–III.k), each with a detailed commentary considering the current state of Schelling research.

The translation and (importantly) the instructions given by Schelling stand for themselves. Obviously, the commentary, insofar as it provides contextualization, is influenced by what we have identified as these main intentions. This identification, however, is, as the following shows, the result of a careful and rigorous reading both of Schelling's own statements in the documents and the numerous sources mentioned in the footnotes.

## 5. Translation of Testament

### *I. Older Manuscripts (Jena and Würzburg Years)*

#### Overview Of What Will Be My Literary Estate

##### Manuscripts

##### A. in Quarto

##### 1) Older

- a) Msc. in large 4, titled: *Philosophy of Art* [*Philosophie der Kunst*]. More or less the entire chapter: *On Tragedy* [*Von der Tragödie*] would be print-worthy. Other chapters partially at most.
- b) Various lectures on *The System of Philosophy* [*System der Philosophie*]; in part (large 4) written still in Jena, in part (small 4) written in Würzburg. Contains at most fractions that would be usable, if you, Fritz or Hermann, want to put in the effort to sort through, otherwise to be burned.

Editorial Information (I.): Bibl. 15. *The System of Philosophy* most likely refers to either bibl. 19 or 22.

## II. Newer Manuscripts (Munich Years from 1810 until Erlangen Years)

### 2) Newer.

- a) One manuscript on pag. 1 labeled X—containing individual numbered sentences from 1–590. This msc. contains the earliest<sup>33</sup> studies on the intended work: *The Ages of the World* [*Die Weltalter*], which, contrary to the understanding of many, was not intended to be historical-philosophical, but rather concerned itself with the χρόνους αἰώνιους.<sup>34</sup> There may be other viable, ultimately unused kernel<sup>35</sup> here and there. If Fritz and Hermann consider those to be worth preserving, they may be published as *Fragments* [*Fragmente*], otherwise to be destroyed.
- b) A second manuscript (small 4) containing sketches for my private lectures held in Stuttgart before a circle of friends in 1810 (late president Georgii's transcript<sub>n</sub><sup>36</sup> (enclosed) may aid with the deciphering). Whether to be used entirely or partially, *penes vos judicium sit*.<sup>37</sup> Incidentally, much therein remains inchoate as I found the decisive ideas only in the following years.
- c) A third manuscript containing the first *Erlangen Lectures* [*Erlanger Vorlesungen*], in content only, as they were not read from the manuscript (two transcripts<sub>n</sub>, one bound, the other unbound, each an individual booklet). Partially usable at most; to be destroyed if I have not found the time to do it myself.

---

<sup>33</sup> Fuhrmans: latest.

<sup>34</sup> “Eternal times” or “eternal ages.” See e.g., F.W.J. Schelling, *Urfassung der Philosophie der Offenbarung*, ed. Walter Ehrhardt, 2 vols. (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1992), 209. [=Urfassung; see bibl. 17.]

<sup>35</sup> Fuhrmans: Msc.

<sup>36</sup> The German original distinguishes between *Abschrift* and *Nachschrift*, both of which have been translated as “transcript” for lack of distinct English terms. For clarity, we have added subscript *c* for “copy” (*Abschrift*) and subscript *n* for “notes (taken during lecture)” (*Nachschrift*).

<sup>37</sup> I.e., “You be the judge of that.”

- d) A smaller (i.e., shorter) booklet, containing an *Introduction to Philosophy* [*Einleitung in die Philosophie*]<sup>38</sup> delivered at the time.—Same applies as to c)—Partially usable at most for historical purposes.

Editorial Information (II.): Bibl. 8, 21, 10, and 9.

### III. *Newest Manuscripts (Manuscripts on Philosophy of Mythology and Revelation)*

- 3) Newest. These comprise, above all
- a) The concepts for the Lectures on the *Philosophy of Mythology* [*Philosophie der Mythologie*].
- α) A bundle titled: “Oldest Lectures and Preliminary Works on Mythology” [Älteste Vorlesungen und Vorarbeiten zur Mythologie].<sup>39</sup> Some parts still important, in particular the booklet labeled H (the last one in a series of individual booklets beginning with A). The booklet H contains the references (citations) pertaining to the *Doctrine of Mysteries* [*Mysterienlehre*], included as part of the Philosophy of Revelation.

III.a—Editorial Information: Bibl. 16 and 17.

III.a—Commentary:

The doctrine of mysteries is the last step<sup>40</sup> of a *Philosophy of Mythology* and gives a philosophical grounding and analysis of the historical *transition* from mythological religions to religions of revelation.<sup>41</sup> Today, this section is located in the 19th to 23rd lecture of the first (“general”) section of the *Philosophy of*

<sup>38</sup> The text in question is most likely the lecture read under the title *Introductio in universam philosophiam* as published in Vol. II/10,1 of AA, 2020, as the lecture catalogue only announces this lecture for the winter semester 1821/22. See page 109 of the *Editorial Introduction* in the same volume.

<sup>39</sup> Christian Danz dates the first lecture of the *Philosophy of Mythology* as early as 1821, as a part of the Erlangen Lectures. Christian Danz, “Über Bedeutung ‘und Ursprung’ der Mythologie zusammen, weil nicht voneinander zu trennen?: Schellings *Gottheiten von Samothrake* im Kontext der werkgeschichtlichen Entstehung seiner *Philosophie der Mythologie*,” in *Schellings Gottheiten von Samothrake im Kontext*, ed. Christian Danz (Göttingen: V & R unipress; Vienna University Press, 2021), 231–252.

<sup>40</sup> See e.g., SW XII: 162, and more explicitly, 648.

<sup>41</sup> Since his treatise *On the Deities of Samothrace* (1815), Schelling had conducted many studies and readings on the mysteries and related texts, which he compiled in a booklet, which K.F.A. certainly used as references for the publication of *Schelling's collected works*. For the English version, see: F.W.J. Schelling, *On the Deities of Samothrace*, ed. Alexander Bilda, Jason M. Wirth, and David Farrell Krell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2025).

*Revelation* (SW XIII: 411–530), and rightly so, according to Schelling; it is, then, part of the latest architecture and correctly sits right before the beginning of what ultimately remains as the *Philosophy of Revelation* (as opposed to the whole SW XIII–XIV). The testament explicitly incorporates the doctrine of mysteries into the *Philosophy of Revelation*. This suggests that the doctrine of mysteries is the direct systematic transition from the end of the *Philosophy of Mythology* into the *Philosophy of Revelation*, which in turn means: those parts of the *Philosophy of Revelation* that were repetitive or divergent would—in its modified form—(mostly) be dropped from the final architecture, as confirmed by other, later instructions given in the testament.

β) One<sup>42</sup> copy each of two earlier prints of the (historical-critical) *Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology* [*Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie*].<sup>43</sup> (For any comparison with the manuscript mentioned under (αα), and as proof of how long before the final publication the main idea of the *Philosophy of Mythology* had been in my mind).

γ) The main course<sup>44</sup> on the *Philosophy of Mythology* as it was given in Munich (in Summer 1828 for the first time). As the course was subsequently repeated several times, there are many complementing editions; and later drafts refer to, e.g., the respective lectures of 1828 or '30 if those lectures were repeated *simpliciter*. In particular, the stored papers attempting the deduction of monotheism are plentiful. All very useful, but not for printing. The main basis to be used,<sup>45</sup> if I cannot arrange printing of the whole myself, would be the thickest bundle labeled III.

III.b—Editorial Information: Bibl. 13 and 16.

III.b—Commentary:

---

<sup>42</sup> Inserted by second hand.

<sup>43</sup> These earlier prints must have been significantly older than the manuscript intended for publication mentioned under αα). The latter, in particular the 10th lecture, was significantly modified by Schelling as late as 1846 (see F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophische Entwürfe und Tagebücher 1846: Philosophie der Mythologie und reinrationale Philosophie*, ed. Lothar Knatz, Hans Jörg Sandkühler, and Martin Schraven (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2023) [= *Calendar 1846*]; see bibl. 18). But earlier parts of the *Historical-critical Introduction* were probably also reworked by Schelling.

<sup>44</sup> Underlined by second hand.

<sup>45</sup> Namely, for printing.



The “main course” on the *Philosophy of Mythology* had been, since 1828, continuously reused for lectures and developed further, partially written anew, or supplemented with corrections and annotations (the same most likely applied to the “main manuscript” of the *Philosophy of Revelation* below). These iterations produced “many complementing editions” in different bundles on the same subject matter. Only one of those editions, which Schelling called the “main basis,” was to be used for publishing the *Philosophy of Mythology*. The editor also makes reference to this “main basis” in the preliminary remarks<sup>46</sup> to SW XII. This version used by the editor was significantly different from the Munich ones, not least because it features the treatise on monotheism as a complete, standalone<sup>47</sup> text analyzing the historically granted concept of monotheism (i.e., as a historical fact)—a reevaluation and repositioning of the treatise on monotheism that most likely happened after 1845, as we do not yet find this in the notes Henri-Frédéric Amiel took while attending Schelling’s lecture on the Philosophy of Mythology in that year. In any case, this reevaluation and repositioning is in accordance with the testament, which clarifies that *The Monotheism* neither belongs to the negative nor the positive philosophy (see Commentary III.f below).

The mentioned “attempts” of the “deduction” of monotheism in the context of the *Philosophy of Mythology*—i.e., *within* the positive philosophy—are distinctly *not* what Schelling wanted to be published, but rather, despite some valuable parts, to be disregarded. Nevertheless, K.F.A. published some sections from these attempts in *Schelling’s collected works* and labeled them accordingly.<sup>48</sup>

δ) The latest and most important manuscript on the *Philosophy of Mythology* is the one which I have recently<sup>49</sup> prepared for printing, and which is stored in the middle compartment of my standing desk—separate from the other manuscripts (located in my three cabinets). This manuscript contains:

---

<sup>46</sup> Preliminary Remarks to SW XII: vii: “for laying down the final text I focused only on the first [sc. “newer”] manuscripts and out of those particularly on the one which the author requested to be the basis for this publication....” Cf. SW XII: v: “This *Presentation of a Philosophy of Mythology* [*Darstellung der Philosophie der Mythologie*] was read publicly for the last time in the years 1842 and 1845/46 in Berlin, during which time it was last reviewed and, in some parts, newly edited.”

<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, this final arrangement is also what Schelling dictated to his son Paul (*Appendix*).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. for example SW XII: 62 and 101.

<sup>49</sup> Missing in Fuhrmans.

$\alpha\alpha$ ) the historical-critical part of the *Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*: lectures I–X, nicely written, dictated, but not revised.<sup>50</sup> Mistakes, therefore, as they inevitably occur in dictation, must be corrected. Otherwise, this manuscript is fully ready for printing.

### III.c—Commentary:

The “latest and most important manuscript on the *Philosophy of Mythology*” contains the “introduction” to said text, which in turn comprises, first, the historical-critical part (=HKE), mentioned in  $\alpha\alpha$ ), spanning the lectures I–X and of which a clean (albeit not revised) copy dictated by Schelling was available.<sup>51</sup> Second, the “philosophical part” of the introduction to the *Philosophy of Mythology* mentioned in  $\beta\beta$ ), for which Schelling gave detailed instructions. Together they make one manuscript, namely the *Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*, which Schelling arranged as a consecutive succession of lectures (we know from other sources that the philosophical part was numbered with Roman numerals XI–XXII or XXIII) and paginated from start to finish: The highest page number found on a manuscript page is 904.<sup>52</sup> This page contains a passage from today’s 23rd lecture (SW XI: 548–550) and abruptly ends in the middle of a sentence.

These instructions on the two introductory parts are characteristic for Schelling: the plausibility of the task (i.e., positive philosophy) established by the historical-critical analysis is doubted by the “philosophy familiar” (SW XI: 251).<sup>53</sup> Resolving these doubts requires, as a first step, exploring how far a purely rational philosophy can get in accomplishing this task, paving the way, so to say, for a more committed positive philosophy that is to follow and actually succeed. A comprehensive introduction to the actually intended *Philosophy of Mythology* and of *Revelation* consists, then, in the combination of both, the historical-critical part and the purely rational analysis it called for.

---

<sup>50</sup> May be identical to “msc. in Stort’s writing until lecture XI,” mentioned by Schelling in the program for his works, dictated to Paul 1852 (*Appendix*), which is “to be used.”

<sup>51</sup> The part is titled *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology* (*Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie*) and most likely, Schelling, as he always did, added further annotations and changes.

<sup>52</sup> Found by Ehrhardt in one of Schelling’s notebooks titled “1851” (*BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr. 123; see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. F.W.J. Schelling, *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*, ed. Dennis Schmidt, trans. Mason Richey and Markus Zisselsberger (Albany: State University of New York, 2007), 174.

ββ) The philosophical part of the introduction, the purpose<sup>54</sup> of which stems from the following: The last (X<sup>th</sup>) lecture of the preceding part categorizes religion in 1) natural (i.e., mythological) 2) revealed, 3) philosophical [religion], which would have to (*realiter*) comprise the other two—but—does not exist, because the philosophy (the positive) that could comprehend them<sup>55</sup> does not exist.

This motivates the presentation of the purely rational or negative philosophy to show how that philosophy itself ultimately ends with the demand for the positive philosophy. —

### III.d—Commentary:

Schelling's explanation regarding the “purpose” of the philosophical part of the introduction to the *Philosophy of Mythology* requires further elaboration.

The result presented at the end of the historical-critical introduction is as follows: tracing back the actual evolution of human consciousness in its consecutive steps to its historical beginning established that there can be only three types of religion.<sup>56</sup> The first step in the evolution are *mythological religions*, which seem to be directly imposed onto human consciousness and are eventually replaced by a newer type, namely *religions of revelation*. Such are not imposed on the human consciousness but rather are a free devotion to a God who has revealed Himself. The third type of religion, which *comprises (realiter)* the other two, is the *philosophical religion*. It no longer relies on the dogmatic authority of a revelation but rather on the *philosophical insight* into what grounds religion—with its particular character and meaning—in the overall structure of human consciousness. This philosophical insight, then, becomes itself the foundation for religious worship. This, of course, was under the provision that the addressee of all religious worship, i.e., God, actually—and according to this very philosophical insight—*exists*: a provision that, for Schelling, was indeed debatable and for him an open question.

---

<sup>54</sup> The original uses the German term “Bewandtnis”—“Den philosophischen Teil der Einleitung. Mit diesem hat es folgende Bewandtnis.” Any translation of this German word seems unsatisfactory, as it falls short of capturing all of the original's facets and dimensions. “Bewandtnis” not only motivates a certain move and marks the purpose of a certain undertaking, but it also emphasizes the particularly relevant aspect within that which marks a certain purpose.

<sup>55</sup> In the original: “[...] weil die Philosophie nicht existiert, die sie begreifen könnte (die positive).” What requires comprehension here—in our reading—are the mythological and revealed religions (plural). The German grammar, however, would also allow for the following reading: what requires comprehension is religion (singular).

<sup>56</sup> See lecture 10, HKE, SW XI: in particular, 237–251.

For Schelling, there was no example of a *philosophical religion* yet, i.e., the philosophical religion “does not exist.”<sup>57</sup> Moreover, as Schelling explains in the testament,<sup>58</sup> it *cannot* exist as long as the necessary condition for its existence is not fulfilled—which, again, is the aforementioned “philosophical insight” that would comprehend *real* religion in general and in particular the two already existing types of religion.

*This* philosophy (in contrast to a misguided doctrine of reason equating the concept of God with God’s actuality), which comprehends religion in its *peculiar* character, is what Schelling called “positive” philosophy or genuine science (*eigentliche Wissenschaft*),<sup>59</sup> and which he had been trying to develop for so long. Positive philosophy, in this sense, consists in obtaining the needed philosophical insight into the historical succession of the real religions. Additionally, it must be *philosophically*, and in that sense scientifically, established that this succession is *not* one of mere illusions and historical mistakes, but rather one for which the addressee of all religion does, in fact, exist—rather than not exist. *Only then* would the ideal condition (i.e., the *ideal* comprehension of religion) be fulfilled, so that the philosophical religion could take its place in the succession of real religions; that is, it could exist and, as such, could comprise “*realiter*” the other types of religion in human consciousness.<sup>60</sup>

In short: Only once the positive philosophy has comprehended the real religions in thought (ideally), the philosophical religion could become a reality, which would then *realiter* comprise earlier types of religion and thereby take on its legitimate place in the succession of real religions. There remain,

---

<sup>57</sup> *Calendar 1846*, 122; HKE, SW XI: 250; DRP, SW XI: 255. Cf. also, albeit less explicitly, Chovát’s 1842 transcript in F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophie der Mythologie in drei Vorlesungsnachschriften 1837/1842*, ed. Klaus Vieweg and Christian Danz (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1996), 171; see bibl. 16.

<sup>58</sup> Schelling makes this explicit also, e.g., in HKE, SW XI: 250, and in DRP, SW XI: 255.

<sup>59</sup> See lecture 16, DRP, SW XI: 366–374.

<sup>60</sup> DRP, SW XI: pp.568: “Only with the transition to the positive philosophy we enter the subject matter of religion and religions, and we can only now expect the philosophical religion to come into existence, which must comprise *realiter* the real religions, that is, the mythological and the revealed religion, and it now becomes evident that what we call philosophical religion has nothing in common with the so-called religion of reason.”

however, strong philosophically valid *objections of reason*<sup>61</sup> against taking religion as a legitimate subject matter of philosophy. What must be done, therefore, is to show that philosophy of reason (i.e., negative philosophy), once completely exhausted, ultimately provides the rational license for the *demand* for positive philosophy.

This demand for positive philosophy is reached through the second of these two steps: First, the goal of positive philosophy is legitimized in pure ( $\neq$  purely rational) *thinking*, which naturally culminates in and carves out a *functional position* for a proper principle potentially assumed by that which we refer to under the name “God.” It must then, additionally, be shown how a philosophy of reason is ultimately unable to grasp the addressee of religion—neither as a concept nor as existent. This is, then, the “purpose” of the philosophical part of the *Introduction*: developing the above-mentioned demand for a positive philosophy out of philosophically legitimized concepts and strict *a priori* principles and methods; and thereby dissolving the “objections of reason” against positive philosophy.

This part ( $\beta\beta$ ), unfortunately, remains incomplete to date and from lecture XV onwards partially differing concepts exist. If I am unable to do so, Fritz and Hermann shall take care of publication. I have no doubt they will proceed with the same reverence for their father’s legacy that they had for him in life. Where Fritz is in doubt, he shall ask Hermann and vice versa. —Hermann recently lived with me for some time<sup>62</sup> and therefore had the opportunity to familiarize himself with my thinking on various matters. Most importantly: where possible, what is available is to be made into a whole (up to the above-mentioned goal) [[= demand for the positive philosophy]].

### III.e—Commentary:

---

<sup>61</sup> Schelling to Ulrich v. Zech, Berlin 26 May 1851 (Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Chart. A 2085a I; see bibl. *Manuscripts*): “this work which intends to completely conclude philosophy as a science of pure reason and to bring it to its last crisis, something Kant’s critique had only begun, and, after having fully done justice to it, to have totally free space for a positive philosophy.” Schelling’s letter to K.F.A. on 15 June 1851 (Plitt, *Aus Schellings Leben* III, 228): “The intention is to fully conclude the negative philosophy, to bring it to an end, from which there is no return. I deemed this work necessary, because, as long as it has not received full justice, it maintains at least silent objections against the higher, positive, and no one would commit to the latter with all their soul.”

<sup>62</sup> See Schelling’s letter to Hermann from 14 February 1853 (*BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr.863; see bibl. *Manuscripts*), printed, albeit wrongly dated in Otto Braun, “Briefe Schellings an seine Söhne Fritz und Hermann” in *Hochland. Monatsschrift für alle Gebiete des Wissens / der Literatur & Kunst* 9, (October 1911–March 1912): 316–327, here 327.

Lecture XV (February 1853) in the completed manuscript is equivalent with today's 16th lecture, as can be seen in the correspondence on later publishing activities, and by taking into account a new arrangement<sup>63</sup> from September 1855, which divided the 14th lecture into two. What is here taken to be “complete” is likely a transcript<sub>c</sub> of today's lectures 12–16, which collection Schelling had his son-in-law Ulrich make in 1851, and which he then sent to his son K.F.A.<sup>64</sup> However, as we know from his latest calendars,<sup>65</sup> Schelling continued reviewing and probably changing this manuscript until his death.

While there was in early 1853 a “completed” line of thought only up to lecture 16, “differing concepts” on the further development of the DRP up to lecture XXII (today's 23rd lecture) already existed.<sup>66</sup>

When Schelling died one and half years later, there even existed (according to letters)<sup>67</sup> a clean copy including up to the 17th (today's 18th to 19th) lecture. This was to be followed by insertions of Schelling's two last presentations to the Academy in 1850 (*On the Dimensions of the Bodily*)<sup>68</sup> and 1852 (*On Adjectives with μᾶ*)<sup>69</sup> into the 18th to 20th lectures. Then, in today's 20th lecture, we find a retrospective summary of the development of a purely

---

<sup>63</sup> See letter from K.F.A. to his brother Hermann, with the title “Sonntag Morgen” and without date, presumably right after the letter from 15 September 1855 (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Ana 608.B.III., see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

<sup>64</sup> Schelling to K.F.A. on 15 June 1851: “As this will be my last word, it demands a lot of time, and I am still, as I am alone and without help, not finished. God give, I'll be allowed to complete it. [...] The biggest and most important part is complete, but the conclusion is missing. I waited some time for the transcript<sub>c</sub> that I am enclosing with this letter. The dear Ulrich [Zech] has had many struggles with it as the original was written hastily and in part I had written only sketches for free delivery” (Plitt, *Aus Schellings Leben* III, 228).

<sup>65</sup> See especially *Calendar 1853* (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr.74; see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

<sup>66</sup> See for example *Calendar 1852* (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 73; see bibl. *Manuscripts*). Cf. Buchheim, *Schellings 'Unvollendete.'*

<sup>67</sup> Letter from K.F.A. to Waitz on 12 January 1855: “[...] Regarding my work, I am, so far, making swift progress, as a clean transcript<sub>c</sub> up until lecture 17 has been found, which does not require further work (as father himself had declared it ready for publication), other than rewriting or amending the text according to the penciled-in corrections, additions, sentence changes, which are found on almost every page of the first X lectures” (Letter: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften Datenbank [= *BAdW-D-Schelling*; available via: <https://schelling.badw.de/start/>], folder 12; see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

<sup>68</sup> *Ueber eine principielle Ableitung der drei Dimensionen des Körperlichen*, read at the “Gesamtsitzung” of the academy in Berlin on 19 December 1850 (see SW XI: vi; the presentation is preserved at Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Ana 608.A.3; see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

<sup>69</sup> *Ueber einige mit μᾶ zusammengesetzte griechische Adjective*, read at the “Gesamtsitzung” of the academy in Berlin on 5 February 1852 (see SW XI: vi; the presentation is preserved in *Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach* no. 56.1462; see bibl. *Manuscripts*).



rational philosophy up to this point, which was most likely written by Schelling himself (SW XI: 488–489).<sup>70</sup>

We can therefore assume that after Schelling's passing, the manuscripts for lectures 1–20 were complete and their arrangement was mostly laid out. For lectures 21 to 23, as we know them today, relatively mature concepts existed.<sup>71</sup> The already mentioned sheet, paginated 903 and 904, contains a passage, written by Schelling himself, which is virtually identical to a passage in today's 23rd lecture (SW XI: 548–550). This in turn suggests that the manuscript must have been paginated at least up to this point. Everything from there on exists as sketches and notes only. This includes, importantly, the completion of the philosophical introduction (i.e., the end of negative philosophy) until the “demand” (through the individual having become practical), as well as the outlook on the further development of the investigation toward a positive philosophy.

However, to be noted: This second part of the introduction ( $\beta\beta$ ) must not displace the treatise on Monotheism [*Der Monotheismus*], with which otherwise the transition to the actual development was made.<sup>72</sup> Rather, once ( $\beta\beta$ ) is brought to the above-mentioned point (demand for the positive<sup>73</sup> philosophy), it is to be broken off with the following words: “These lectures do not intend to explicate the positive philosophy, rather the principles necessary for the actual establishing of a philosophy of mythology are to be gained on the path contained within

---

<sup>70</sup> Cf. F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophische Entwürfe und Tagebücher: aus dem Berliner Nachlaß. Vol. 14, 1849: Niederlage der Revolution und Ansarbeitung der reinrationalen Philosophie*, ed. Martin Schraven (Hamburg: Meiner, 2007). [=Calendar 1849] (See bibl. 18.) On page 69, we find a passage that mirrors (almost verbatim) an important part of this summary. In the calendar the wording is as follows: “With a<sup>0</sup> the dilemma arises of an inner-divine or an outer-divine world, outside of God (admittedly only seemingly <as> actually posited or) actualized. [Mit a<sup>0</sup> entsteht das Dilemma einer innergöttlichen oder einer außergöttlichen, außer Gott (freilich bloß scheinbar <als> wirklich gesetzten oder) verwirklichten Welt.]” In the DRP's summary passage, we then find, talking again about a<sup>0</sup>, the following: “the dilemma of an inner-divine world actualized in God, or a world actualized outside of God [...] [das Dilemma einer innergöttlichen, in Gott verwirklichten, oder einer außer Gott verwirklichten Welt gegeben]” (SW XI: 489).

<sup>71</sup> This assumption is in line with comments made by the editor K.F.A. in SW XI: 553n1.

<sup>72</sup> Fuhrmans: with which itself (womit selbst).

<sup>73</sup> “+” replaced with “positive” by second hand.



the granted concept (here that of monotheism) that is assumed<sup>74</sup> and whose preconditions are found by analytical investigation.”<sup>75</sup> This is where the earlier treatise on monotheism is situated.

NB. This second part, as far as it exists, is in my handwriting; a large portion, however, is in a transcript by Ulrich, which will be very useful for deciphering.<sup>76</sup>

### III.f—Commentary:

These instructions make clear that the treatise *The Monotheism* (MOT) is to be the third book of the new order,<sup>77</sup> which makes up the latest systematic architecture, i.e., Schelling’s attempt to execute post-Kantian metaphysics. This rearrangement and its methodology establish MOT as neither part of the negative philosophy, which in the above-mentioned sense “ends” with the “demand” for positive philosophy, nor yet the beginning of the positive philosophy.

*The Monotheism’s* intermediary role is rooted in Schelling’s insight that in order for MYL to begin, something additional is required that is to be provided by MOT. Specifically, the “actual establishing,” i.e., MYL’s positive-philosophical explication, requires a justified reidentification of those metaphysical “principles,” which were, so far, grounded in pure thought as the

---

<sup>74</sup> This new function and method of the treatise on monotheism, namely that it is an “analytical investigation” that operates from a “granted concept” without thereby implicitly already assuming God or even a rationally grounded idea of God, is mirrored in the second lecture in the treatise. Cf. MOT XII: 29–30: “It will now therefore be necessary to find the path from this absolute oneness to the oneness of God as such. [...] for that to which I am to go must not yet be posited with that from which I am departing. Our investigation must therefore also move in this direction, insofar as it [...] proceeds from absolute oneness, which is based solely on the fact that God is being itself, to the oneness of God as such [Es wird also nun darauf ankommen, von dieser absoluten Einzigkeit aus den Weg zur Einzigkeit Gottes *als solchen* zu finden. [...] denn das, wozu ich fortgehen soll, muß mit dem, *von* dem ich fortgehe, noch nicht gesetzt sein. In dieser Richtung hat sich also auch unsere Untersuchung zu bewegen, inwiefern sie [...] von der absoluten Einzigkeit, die eben nur darauf beruht, daß Gott das Seyende selbst ist, zur Einzigkeit Gottes als solchen fortgehen soll].” The German term “*angenommen*” is here best translated as “assumed” but would also allow for “accept” or “acknowledge.” Here, “assuming” the conception of monotheism as a starting point rests on the legitimacy of the historical prevalence (“granted”) of the concept of monotheism.

<sup>75</sup> Interestingly, this passage was ultimately not included verbatim in any published version of Schelling’s works. The sense of Schelling’s words can nonetheless be found in SW XII: 8. Notably, this passage is part of the treatise on monotheism and not the DRP.

<sup>76</sup> On the different transcripts and their scope, see commentary III.e.

<sup>77</sup> See dictation to Paul 1852 (*Appendix*).



structural principles of all being in the purely rational philosophy.<sup>78</sup> Importantly, what is needed is *not* another justification of mythology as a philosophical subject matter, but rather of the *principles* with which the historical-mythological material is to be dissected. The legitimacy of these principles in the negative philosophy is limited to all *possible ontic being*,<sup>79</sup> which is why their applicability within the positive philosophy<sup>80</sup>—and in that way to all representations of a supposedly real *God* throughout history—must first be established through a *conceptual analysis* of the historically granted concept “monotheism.” This need for an additional and systematically different justification is itself a result of the DRP, which shows that God, if he exists, does not belong to the realm of *possible ontic being*.

Later in his testament, Schelling returns to the above-explained issue (cf. commentary III.h) when he instructs dropping from the *Philosophy of Revelation* those passages where he still considered it to be a task of positive philosophy to “motivate that one take God as Prius, ontic being as Posterius, and further, to procure the constitutive principles of ontic being.”

If needed, the individual folio sheets on my desk may help to gain insight into how I wanted to conclude this second part ( $\beta\beta$ ). However, since they do not contain something definitive throughout, but only notes for my own use, they require careful<sup>81</sup> selection. In order to ease this transition, I would like to add the following, which is

---

<sup>78</sup> In December 1852, in a letter to his friend and student Hubert Beckers (professor of philosophy at Munich University as of 1847), Schelling writes about the above-mentioned “principles”: “I thank you in particular for the comment on the doctrine of principles or potencies being my metaphysics: it is not only the foundation, but rather the material for the further development of the rational philosophy. How the positive [philosophy], for which this doctrine is equally necessary, will obtain these principles is another question on which I have only just reached clarity myself” (Plitt, *Aus Schellings Leben* III, 241).

<sup>79</sup> The most prevalent translation for *Seiendes/Seyendes* is “that which has being.” We have adopted the, in our opinion, more elegant translation, “ontic being,” introduced in Brady Bowman, “Force, Existence, and the Transcendence of the Good in Schelling’s *Weltalter* (1815),” in *Internationales Jahrbuch für Deutschen Idealismus: Der deutsche Idealismus und die Rationalisten* 14 (2016), ed. Dina Emundts and Sally Sedgwick (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), 265–293.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. lecture 13, DRP, SW XI: 299: “Whatever is ontic being, will, albeit in a particular form and one more than the other, be expressed, but each will contain these elements, which are not principles in relation to the principle, but principles in relation to the deduced and can at least serve as access and guidance to the principle itself.” This means that the metaphysical “principles” of all ontic being, which receive philosophical justification through complete induction of pure thought in the DRP, must not yet be applied to *the* principle sought after—namely God. That is why their applicability in regard to “God,” and everything that would be directly linked to God, must be justified in MOT in a completely different way (i.e., conceptual analysis).

<sup>81</sup> “*besondere*” [special] corrected to “*besonnen*” [careful] by second hand.

understandable for those who read the earlier lectures (beginning with XI).—In the negative philosophy, i.e., in which is the pure<sup>82</sup> science of reason [die reine Vernunftwissenschaft], ontic being [das Seyende] is the prius, that which is ontic being [das, was das Seyende ist] (God) is the posterius. Negative philosophy ends with the I demanding the reversal, which is first pure willing (analogous to Kant’s postulate of practical reason, but with the difference that it is not reason, but the I (having become practical), that as personal itself demands personality and says: I want that which is beyond ontic being.) This willing, however, is only the beginning: For that which is beyond ontic being to evince its existence, for there to be a science of it (i.e., a positive<sup>83</sup> philosophy), there must be something against which it evinces itself as existing and this is again ontic being, now as the Posterius or<sup>84</sup> Consequens of the former. See *On the Sources of Eternal Truths* for more on this consequence; Fritz has already received a transcript<sub>c</sub> of this treatise.

III.g—Editorial Information: Bibl. 4.1 and 4.

III.g—Commentary:

In the last one and a half years before his death, Schelling did not complete the concluding lectures of the philosophical part of the introduction (=DRP). What he achieved, as also mentioned by K.F.A. in *Schelling’s collected works* (SW XI: 553 n1), were more or less comprehensive “folio sheets” (“Conceptblätter”), on which he had sketched out the critical lines of reasoning of the DRP’s ending and the upcoming movement to the positive philosophy. K.F.A. used those sheets to compile today’s 24th lecture of the DRP, which he did to the best of his knowledge and “according to the suggestions left by the author himself.”<sup>85</sup> In doing so, he most likely added his own complimentary remarks and transitions between the original passages.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Fuhrmans: “in der die Vernunftwissenschaft ist.”

<sup>83</sup> “+” replaced with “positive” by second hand.

<sup>84</sup> Fuhrmans: and.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. SW XI: 553n1.

<sup>86</sup> See Müller-Bergen and Sartori, *Die Feder des seligen Vaters*. See also Buchheim, *Schellings ‘Unvollendete,’* 22.

The testament, letters, notebooks and calendars<sup>87</sup> show that the editor prominently placed Schelling's latest notes at the end of the 24th lecture. These notes shape the progression of the undertaking toward a positive philosophy by asking two questions, which strongly reflect Schelling's latest revision. Cornerstone and point of reference for this revised latest philosophy, as is also confirmed by the testament, is the treatise *On The Source(s) of Eternal Truths* (=QEW). As an additional part of negative philosophy, Schelling instructed it to follow the end of the "pure science of reason" (=DRP). This means, in turn, that the DRP does not mark the end of the philosophical part of the introduction to the *Philosophy of Mythology*. The "demand of positive philosophy" in the "I having become practical" (= end of the DRP) is followed by an *additional* step of negative philosophy, namely QEW. It takes on the last duty of negative philosophy, which is to answer with purely conceptual means the *first* question: "how is it possible that  $-A + A \pm A$  can be consequence of  $A^0$ ?" (DRP SW XI: 570). Only answering this first question brings the philosophical introduction to its true end.

Now, even with the end of the philosophical introduction, we still have not reached the starting point for positive philosophy. As specified in commentary III.f, at this point, the testament instructs postponing again the actual undertaking of the *Philosophy of Mythology*, which one could certainly expect to finally begin. Instead, "the principles necessary for actually explicating the Philosophy of Mythology" must be justified anew by means of the conceptual analysis of monotheism. Schelling's testament, then, provides a type of *movement*—through several distinct steps, from the end of the science of reason to the beginning of a positive philosophy—that is completely different from what the *Berlin Introduction* postulates. Nevertheless, the *Berlin Introduction* has remained the dominant point of reference, and what it laid out as a system has been considered the framework and vantage point for the majority of reconstructions of Schelling's latest philosophy.

---

<sup>87</sup> Letter by K.F.A. to his brother Hermann, dated 8 September 1855: "The transition to the academy-treatise [=QEW], however, is, as you will see, indispensable and follows the suggestions of the dear father literally, so that if you were to prefer the treatise to be a simple add-on, it would require to assume and consequently add this transition as its beginning, which in turn would again merge it with the lectures." (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Ana 608.B.III, see bibl. *Manuscripts*). One parallel version of this last step within the negative philosophy is found in K.F.A.'s preamble to SW XII: viiin1. This parallel version we know to be from the above-mentioned notebook, stored in the Berlin archive (*BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr. 123, 3). This proves, then, that the final part of the DRP's (SW XI: 570–572) raising the two questions (of which the first one, as negative philosophy's last duty, is answered by QEW) is Schelling's own thought from the last years of his life.

b) The concepts of my lectures on the *Philosophy of Revelation* [*Philosophie der Offenbarung*]. The main manuscript is the one where each lecture has the additional label O before or after its identifying number (e.g., O I or X  $\alpha$ <sup>88</sup> (X  $\circ$ ). There are two additional manuscripts to the main one which are labeled O<sup>2</sup> and O<sup>3</sup>; these are to be considered different versions, different attempts of justification, which allow for comparison and use, but are unsuitable for publishing. In terms of the development of the *Philosophy of Revelation* itself,<sup>89</sup> publication may follow the main manuscript<sup>90</sup> only, although a manuscript (bound) in a different handwriting than mine but corrected by me will be of great advantage. Concerning the actual philosophical basis (as in the *Philosophy of Revelation* the accepted concept of monotheism is no longer to be used as means of development), i.e., to motivate that one take God as Prius, ontic being as Posterius, and further, to procure the constitutive principles of ontic being, one would simply refer to ( $\beta\beta$ ) (in particular the lecture preparing the transition to a positive<sup>91</sup> philosophy) and consider the whole as proven by what has preceded.

### III.h—Commentary:

For the *Philosophy of Revelation* there is one distinct “main manuscript” that is to be used for publication and, as mentioned later in the testament, this manuscript “originated during [Schelling’s] time in Munich.” Schelling had been continuously reworking, rewriting, and adding to his standard manuscript over several lecture cycles, which ultimately resulted in this main manuscript. Comparison of the SW-version with the *Paulus transcript* of the Berlin lectures of 1841/42 (see below) confirms<sup>92</sup> that the “main manuscript” (which stemmed from Munich times) has been in fact the one which was used for publishing.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Additionally, a small fragment-letter was added (with a different pencil afterward) turning the approximately-like Greek- $\alpha$ -looking letter decisively into an  $\alpha$ . However, “X  $\circ$ ” was added in brackets already in the original. Fuhrmans: “ $\alpha\alpha$  X.”

<sup>89</sup> Schelling at times uses this title to refer only to the special part of the *Philosophy of Revelation* (SW XIV); see e.g., *Urfassung*, 154.

<sup>90</sup> Fuhrmans: main transcript<sub>c</sub>.

<sup>91</sup> “+” replaced with “positive” by second hand.

<sup>92</sup> Contrary to Ehrhardt’s assumption that K.F.A. had used the Berlin version for publication (see *Urfassung*, 739–741).

<sup>93</sup> The editor (K.F.A.) himself stated, in his preamble to SW XIII: viii: “The Philosophy of Revelation itself was published based on what the author named the main manuscript as well as existing auxiliary manuscripts.”

Moreover, the *Philosophy of Revelation* as published in *Schelling's collected works* (XIII and XIV) is—albeit not in all parts<sup>94</sup>—in close to sometimes literal concordance with the *Original Version of the Philosophy of Revelation* (*Urfassung der Philosophie der Offenbarung*), which Schelling had completed and presented in 1831/32, and which was published by Walter E. Ehrhardt in 1992 (cf. bibl. 17). The published version of the *Philosophy of Revelation*, then, is not based on the Berlin version of this lecture, but rather on the Munich version that developed out of the *Urfassung*—except for some important late changes (and deletions) in the general portion, which presumably were taken from the “manuscript (bound) in a different handwriting.” This manuscript “in a different handwriting” could very well be the one mentioned in the following paragraphs (see  $\alpha$  to  $\beta$ ) below, which contained the Berlin version of the *Philosophy of Revelation* as well as BI. A portion of the clean copy of that manuscript made by Stort survived; Schelling wanted certain improvements and corrections to be transferred to the older Munich version of the *Philosophy of Revelation*.

The other manuscripts O<sup>2</sup> and O<sup>3</sup>, which are to be considered “different attempts of justification,” most likely stem from Schelling’s later Munich years<sup>95</sup> and contain attempts to find a more satisfactory justification and introduction to his positive philosophy than he had been able to provide in earlier versions. The “actual philosophical basis” of the *Philosophy of Revelation* most likely refers to those lectures of the first, “general” part of today’s SW-version, in which the “concept of monotheism [...is] used as a means of development” in order to, on the one hand, motivate to (hypothetically) assume “God as Prius” and “ontic being as Posterius” and, on the other hand, to “procure the constitutive principles of ontic being.” Those two steps are the systematic “philosophical basis” of the *Philosophy of Revelation* in its earlier iterations, and they make up no fewer than lectures 10–15 of today’s SW-version. However, K.F.A., as the editor, had a tendency to include *all* seemingly relevant materials in the published version—risking the inclusion of passages that were redundant and even thoughts that the latest revision had rendered outdated. This further obscured the revision of Schelling’s latest years, which was indeed not undesired by the editor (cf. commentary III.j).

Except for this manuscript that originated during my time in Munich, there exist other manuscripts of the *Philosophy of Revelation*:

---

<sup>94</sup> Major parts of lecture 16, and a passage highly relevant to Schelling’s latest revision from the 17th lecture, seem to be added quite late to the manuscript, as they differ from *Urfassung* (SW XII: 337, 353–354, and 357–359).

<sup>95</sup> Especially the winter semester 1834/35, 1836/37, and 1838/39.



( $\alpha$ ) one labeled  $\frac{B}{O}$ , which I read as the *Philosophy of Revelation* in Berlin in 1841/42. The way this manuscript deduces<sup>96</sup> the three principles ( $-A$ ,  $+A$ ,  $\pm A$ ) from God, was motivated by the little time I had, as I would not have been able to finish the task without doubling [doublieren].<sup>97</sup> This deduction could therefore only serve as historical reference, as an attempt which was later replaced with the more correct one (see above), regarding which the treatise *On the Sources of Eternal Truths* is the preferred text.<sup>98</sup> Otherwise, this manuscript is to be compared and used alongside the main manuscript. Whether there will be enough time to compare the Paulus version to highlight its falsifications or omissions remains to be seen.

### III.i—Commentary:

The manuscript of the *Philosophy of Revelation* mentioned here is explicitly different from the “main manuscript” from Munich times, and was read in winter 1841/42 in Berlin. It was the (in parts) newly written,<sup>99</sup> condensed version of the entire lecture (which used to take two semesters to read) that Schelling intended to be his inaugural presentation of his philosophy in Berlin. This condensed version of the lecture had the following structure:

First, Schelling had written a new introduction<sup>100</sup> for that purpose, focusing on the difference between negative and positive philosophy and the transition from the former to the latter. This introduction (not yet the text later known as the *Berlin Introduction*) attempted to sketch out a negative or purely rational philosophy, and in doing so to *contribute* (albeit only negatively) to the overall course of the positive philosophy—while standing, however, before the actual transition to the positive philosophy.

*Second*, as can be seen in the *Paulus transcript*, the beginning of the positive philosophy is followed by a new, now positive, deduction of the three

---

<sup>96</sup> See *Paulus transcript*, 102–110 and 160–176, on how the obtainment of the potencies takes place in the context of the negative and positive philosophy, respectively.

<sup>97</sup> I.e., shortening; the expression “doubling” stems from the textile industry: Broad fabric panels were folded lengthwise, which doubled the layers of fabric and allowed for them to be rolled up into more compact, i.e., shorter, rolls; this made them easier to store and transport.

<sup>98</sup> The *Source(s) of Eternal Truths* establishes that the three “principles” have an autonomous source of reason vis-à-vis God, which makes human thought and all truth-functional operations completely independent from God (see i.e.: QEW, SW XI: 585).

<sup>99</sup> See Tilliette, *Schelling im Spiegel*, No.534; and *Arnold Ruge Rezension*, in Frank (ed.), *Paulus transcript*, 331–390.

<sup>100</sup> See F.W.J. Schelling, *Einleitung in Grundlegung der positiven Philosophie, Münchner Vorlesung WS 1832/33 und SS 1833*, ed. Horst Fuhrmans (Turin: Bottega d’Erasmus, 1972), 40 and 44n2.

principles or potencies<sup>101</sup> from the initial concept of the positive philosophy (i.e., “God” as the “pre-conceptual being”),<sup>102</sup> establishing that it is hypothetically possible that creation emerged from these three potencies of God; i.e., ontic being can be fully comprehended through these three potencies.

*Third*, the concept of monotheism is then used to establish this deduction not only as hypothetically possible but historically plausible. The lecture continues with explications of the possibility of human freedom in God and the emancipation of the individual from God, which in turn resulted in the imposition of mythology on the human consciousness, ultimately ending in the *Doctrine of the Mysteries*. This is where the *special* part of the *Philosophy of Revelation* begins and is developed up to the end of the Johannine ages of the church.

As the testament clearly shows, this Berlin attempt at a *Philosophy of Revelation* was labeled “ $\frac{B}{O}$ ” and not just “B” as suggested in Fuhrmans’s publication! Schelling labeled all his newly conceptualized Berlin lectures in this style: the numerator contained the “B” and the denominator contained the special abbreviation for a particular lecture.<sup>103</sup> This is important because the manuscript labeled  $\frac{B}{EO}$ , which is mentioned in the next paragraph of the testament, could, consequently, *not* have been the conjoined manuscript B *plus* EO (= the complete manuscripts of the Berlin *Philosophy of Revelation*),<sup>104</sup> but rather *only* have been the “Berlin Introduction to the Philosophy of Revelation” as it was read until 1844.

As Schelling clarifies in the testament, he no longer considered the way in which the Berlin version of the *Philosophy of Revelation* deduces the “three principles (–A, +A, ±A) from God” to be satisfactory. Rather, the principles are to be procured differently (following the pattern of the latest philosophy

<sup>101</sup> Similar to the so-called *Other Deduction of the Principles of the Positive Philosophy* (*Andere Deduktion der Prinzipien der positiven Philosophie*), which K.F.A. published separately in SW XIV: 337–356 (cf. *Paulus transcript*, 160–171).

<sup>102</sup> See e.g., *Paulus transcript*, 161–163.

<sup>103</sup> See *Calendar 1854*, 10: “Worked through all earlier lectures held in Berlin.  $\frac{B}{O}$ ,  $\frac{B}{EO}$  and later  $\frac{B}{+}$ ”; and the next day’s entry reads: “proceeded as 11. (with  $\frac{B}{EO}$ ).”

<sup>104</sup> Based on Fuhrmans’s published transcript of the testament, which contains the incomplete abbreviation “B,” Müller-Bergen and Sartori, *Die Feder des seligen Vaters*, 128–129, assumed (as we now see, incorrectly) that “ $\frac{B}{EO}$ ” refers to “EO” *plus* B. For further details on the manuscripts, see Thomas Buchheim, “Der Unterschied zwischen positiver und negativer Philosophie in der Berliner Philosophie der Offenbarung. Eine kontrastierende Betrachtung,” in *Schellings Berliner Vorlesungen der Philosophie der Offenbarung*, *Schellingiana* 36, ed. Christian Danz (Stuttgart/Bad-Cannstatt: frommann holzboog, 2026), 35–64, especially 40–47.

of reason), as explained in QEW. QEW demonstrates the consistently thinkable *possibility* of the preconceptual individuality of God having stepped into the “circle” of “reason” (which, as an autonomous potentiality, is completely independent from God) by first “cloaking” himself in it.<sup>105</sup>

(β) another manuscript labeled  $\frac{B}{EO}$  (*Berlin Introduction to the Philosophy of Revelation* [*Berliner Einleitung zur Philosophie der Offenbarung*]) is bundled with a transcript<sub>c</sub> of the above (α), which was used for later presentations<sup>106</sup> in 1842 and as it seems another in 1844. This one, too, contains useful material, in particular the corrections. However, the whole  $\frac{B}{EO}$  would be unsuitable for printing. Upon reviewing, only the introductory lectures<sup>107</sup> seemed worthy of standalone publication. Of this  $\frac{B}{EO}$ , apparently the one for the ‘42-sessions, there exists:

(γ) a second transcript<sub>n</sub> in large 4 that, where cited, is cited as the one by Stort, which I also corrected and supplemented as I used it. This also can be of use, however, it requires (where not corrected) comparison with the original as it contains many errors.

III.j—Editorial Information: Bibl. 2.

III.j—Commentary:

As mentioned above, Schelling’s debut lecture in Berlin was received poorly. In 1842, as a response to this bad reception, Schelling conceived and wrote a fully revised, much more detailed alternative to the introductory lectures that had been part of the 1841/42 debut lecture. This revised version is what the testament refers to as “another manuscript labeled  $\frac{B}{EO}$ .”<sup>108</sup>

<sup>105</sup> QEW, SW XI: 588.

<sup>106</sup> The word “Wintersemester” of the original was crossed out with ink (i.e., by the first hand) and replaced with “ein weiteres.” “Weiteres” [another] was corrected with “späteres” [a later one] by the second hand.

<sup>107</sup> In Fuhrmans’s edition, “(EO)” is added.

<sup>108</sup> As we can see in the manuscript, Schelling remarked in his 1842/43 lectures, at the end of the first lecture (not included in the published version): “I merely announced this lecture as introduction to the philosophy of revelation to show that it would entertain the same topics and questions that I have addressed in my introduction to the philosophy of revelation last winter. The difference will only be that the current lectures can further deal with individual aspects as I now restrict myself to the mere introduction, which was not possible to me back then when I had the whole big matter of the philosophy of revelation as my subject” (*BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr.106, 24).

Schelling himself called this the “Berlin Introduction to the Philosophy of Revelation,” and it contained significantly more than today’s *Berlin Introduction*, which had been published (after significant revisions after Schelling’s death by K.F.A.) in SW.

In addition to the “introductory lectures” (“Einleitungsvorlesungen”), which we also find in SW, albeit only as the version edited and revised by K.F.A., the “manuscript labeled  $\frac{B}{EO}$ ” contained a series of additional lectures on the historic relation between positive and negative philosophy, which, Schelling claimed, had been misunderstood for so long, most prominently by Hegel and by himself in his own early philosophy. Further,  $\frac{B}{EO}$  contained the complete *Other Deduction* (AD), which, as Schelling explicitly lays down earlier in the testament, was not to be published at all: “only the introductory lectures” of the whole  $\frac{B}{EO}$ .<sup>109</sup> This extensive “manuscript labeled  $\frac{B}{EO}$ ” was a clean copy made by Dr. Alois Stort—Schelling’s writer at the time—and, as can be deduced from the two partial manuscripts we have today,<sup>110</sup> comprised no fewer than 497 pages, which is about twice the length of the *Berlin Introduction* published in SW.

However, even this second, more extensive attempt (written as a reaction to his unsuccessful debut lecture) at introducing and justifying the Philosophy of Revelation did—as Schelling himself believed—not fully resolve the critical issues of this particular philosophical undertaking.

For two more years (until the last lecture in the summer semester of 1844), Schelling repeatedly overhauled the *Berlin Introduction to the Philosophy of Revelation* (=  $\frac{B}{EO}$ ), shortening it in some parts and extending it in others: He made countless annotations in the margins, crossed out passages, and added others. The result of this intensive but ultimately fruitless endeavor is what today we find in the two partial manuscripts: “Nr. 106” ( $\approx$  BI) and “Nr. 97”

---

<sup>109</sup> The scope of the 1842/43 lecture, which was the template for the manuscript  $\frac{B}{EO}$ , can be deduced from the—unfortunately only partially preserved—transcript (by an anonymous attendee) stored in the *Depot Winteler* in the Argau Staatsarchiv.

<sup>110</sup> *BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr. 106 and *BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr. 97.

( $\approx$  AD).<sup>111</sup> Schelling's philosophical thinking at the time circled around the following problem: If the negative philosophy ultimately culminates in the *concept* (Begriff) or the *idea* of God, then the positive philosophy must not use this very *concept* to deduce those analytic principles that would allow investigating, in a positively-scientific way, whether God's existence is the actual answer among the possible answers left by the negative philosophy, as using the concept would constitute an inadmissible implication of God within the analytic principles, fatally undermining the soundness of the subsequent analysis. Schelling's continued dissatisfaction with the Berlin introduction ultimately led him to give up on modifying the text and, as laid out in the testament, to exclude it from his latest architecture. Taking a new route in 1846, he focused instead on the previously discussed DRP: an introduction with both a completely different methodology and endpoint.

The "second transcript<sub>n</sub>," mentioned in  $\gamma$ ), was also written by Stort and probably commissioned because Schelling wanted to capture the significant changes and corrections he intended for the lectures of the winter semester 1842/43. Those lectures were then again followed by another round of review and modification in which Schelling seems to have replaced extensive passages within  $\frac{B}{EO}$  with the respective passages of the "second transcript<sub>n</sub>."<sup>112</sup> However, as the testament refers to this "second transcript<sub>n</sub>," which means it still existed as such at the time when the testament was drafted, we can assume that the pages with the respective passages were not taken out, but rather, were copied and integrated into  $\frac{B}{EO}$ . This assumption is compatible with the observation that the format of  $\gamma$ ) differs from the format of "Nr. 106."

(c) Concepts for my lectures on the system of philosophy. Which are

---

<sup>111</sup> That the preserved partial manuscripts Nr. 106+Nr. 97 in the Berlin archive are indeed the repeatedly reviewed "manuscript labeled  $\frac{B}{EO}$ " is supported by the fact that the relevant information from the testament is proven accurate: The manuscripts (Nr. 106 and Nr. 97) were used for the 1842/43 lecture (see above, footnote 109) and for the 1844 lecture (on page 55 we find a handwritten remark in the margins: "3rd lecture 1844"). There is also evidence pointing to the fact that conjointly, Nr. 106 and Nr. 97 were added as a (later-written) introductory part to a larger document constituting the Berlin version of the philosophy of revelation as a whole and was the basis for Schelling's more comprehensive lecture in 1841/42. For further information, see bibl. *Manuscripts* and also Müller-Bergen and Sartori, *Die Feder des seligen Vaters*.

<sup>112</sup> In the preserved partial manuscript Nr. 106, we can differentiate the two, because the pages of the original manuscript are paginated by Stort, whereas the pages (copied and) added from the later version are not.

α) the manuscript for the lectures on the *Ages of the World* given in Munich in winter 1827. Only roughly the first lecture is printable in its entirety as it is of historical interest; otherwise only printable in part.

β) one manuscript labeled א [Hebrew Aleph] containing the genetic development of philosophical systems since Descartes. (Again, only parts usable as excerpts.)

γ) one manuscript labeled PP (System of Positive Philosophy).

δ) one labeled BP (*Grounding of Positive*<sup>113</sup> *Philosophy* [Begründung der positiven Philosophie]). Regarding those two, it will depend on whether I will be able to finish<sup>114</sup> the current work (pagina hujus 3,<sup>115</sup> ββ). In this case, out of all these lectures (α–δ) only what would be deemed a supplement or explanation of this last-mentioned work could be extracted. In the opposite case, it must be assessed how much of the parts are usable. The whole must not be printed.

ε) concept of a lecture given in Berlin labeled  $\frac{B}{+}$ ,<sup>116</sup> which, however, requires comparison; may be usable in part.

ζ) a small bundle in large 4 containing p. 93 – 111 of an earlier<sup>117</sup> draft. (Titled: *Tenth Lecture* [Zehnte Vorlesung]; an 11th follows.) Those two lectures address the transition from negative to positive philosophy

---

<sup>113</sup> “+” replaced with “positive” by second hand.

<sup>114</sup> Addition on margin by second hand: “NB” and—barely legible—with broad pencil above: “usp. leave some room” (usp. for *uspium*—somewhere). This could indicate that the second handwriting belonged to K.F.A., who prepared the manuscript for printing.

<sup>115</sup> The transcriber does not refer to page numbers of the transcript, but to the page number of the original.

<sup>116</sup> Based on the mentioning and description of the msc.  $\frac{B}{+}$  in K.F.A.’s edition notes ((*BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr. 78; see bibl. *Manuscripts*), 24 on the right margin), one can almost definitively identify this manuscript with the *Presentation of the Process of Nature* (Darstellung des Naturprozesses), from the winter semester 1843/44. In K.F.A.’s notes, indeed, msc.  $\frac{B}{+}$  is explicitly said to include a theory of space. All this said, it must be borne in mind that the *Presentation of the Process of Nature* constitutes only a fragment of a more comprehensive lecture on the “Principles of Philosophy” (the announced lecture title), whose additional content remains unknown. Possibly cf. F.W.J. Schelling, *Sui principi sommi* [Introduzione alla filosofia (Semestre Estivo 1839)]. *Trascrizione di Garibald Martin Mittermair in Sui principi sommi = Über die höchsten Principien. Filosofia della rivelazione 1841/42 = Philosophie der Offenbarung 1841/42*, ed. and trans. Francesco Tomatis (Milano: Bompiani, 2016), 474–679, which is titled “On the Highest Principles” and contains an earlier version of this theory of space.

<sup>117</sup> “earlier” here means in contrast to the last-mentioned, i.e., a draft written before Berlin.

and contain much that is useful on that matter. To be used especially should I be unable to complete the work mentioned under pag. huj. 3<sup>118</sup> sub ββ. But even were that not the case, a lot of it is helpful and could be used, e.g., the long annotation on p. 108, if not used prior.

### III.k—Editorial Information:

α) The original manuscript is preserved in a fragmentary state in the Munich university library (System der Weltalter WS 1827/28, 4° cod. ms. 1000, cf. bibl. *Manuscripts*). The first lecture is printed in SW IX: 353–366. There are several transcripts<sub>n</sub> of the lecture.<sup>119</sup>

β) Original manuscript of the published text not preserved. Cf. bibl. 27 and 6.

γ) Original manuscript burned. A transcript<sub>n</sub> of the 1832/33 lecture (“The System of the positive Philosophy in its Grounding and Execution” [Das System der positiven Philosophie in seiner Begründung und Ausführung]) is published in: bibl. 12.

δ) Original manuscript burned (“Grounding of the Positive Philosophy” [Begründung der positiven Philosophie]); the lecture was first given in WS 1834/35). Possibly: bibl. 26.

### IV. Other Manuscripts from Munich Time That Contain Partially Publishable Material

#### B. In Folio

1) dictation<sup>120</sup> written by a third party,<sup>121</sup> could *correctis corrigendis* be printable in its entirety. This would change the instruction on the above-mentioned manuscript (ζ) since the content, as far as I

---

<sup>118</sup> Insertion mark in this line, then on the left margin penciled in by second hand: “usp (Platz) [= somewhere (space).]”

<sup>119</sup> F.W.J. Schelling, *System der Weltalter: Münchner Vorlesung 1827/28 in einer Nachschrift von Ernst von Lasaulx*, edited and introduced by Siegbert Peetz (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1990); see bibl. 23.

<sup>120</sup> The here-mentioned dictation is considered to be the “Munich Folio-dictation” (which is also referenced in the dictation to Paul 1852 (*Appendix*)), on the basis of which Schelling established an extensive table of contents in his notebook (*BBAW-A-Schelling*, Nr. 123).

<sup>121</sup> Correction by second hand of “written dictation.”

remember, is the same.<sup>122</sup> If, however, I were to leave the frequently<sup>123</sup> mentioned work (ββ) unfinished, this dictation could be used, or could be of help, to *quodammodo* complete what is missing (in particular with regard to the concept of positive<sup>124</sup> philosophy).

2) several manuscripts in my own handwriting containing the beginnings and first attempts at a dialogue on survival and future life.<sup>125</sup> If Fritz wanted to read them, I would be content. He can evaluate whether parts are usable. The whole is to be destroyed if I don't find the time to do it myself.

3) Two notebooks (Collectanea) bound in paper. These contain mostly excerpts (without any further value, except those on Leibniz, which are complete), i.e., more thoughts by others than my own; nevertheless, the second notebook (titled *collectanea varii generis*) contains a series of critical remarks in Latin on the *Arnobii Disputatio adversus Gentes*, that still (a new edition has been published in the meantime) contain much that is good and useful. I ask dear Hermann to take on this work, render it printable (in Latin) and to publish it in a collection of my works (if there should be one after my passing) or separately. The edition to which these remarks refer, is the one by (I believe I.C.) Orelli (Zurich). A separate envelope (titled *Arnobiana*) containing notes, which served me as orientation for talks at the Academy in Munich, for which I used the remarks on Arnobius for some time, might be helpful to this end. My remarks (in poor handwriting) would be incomprehensible without reference to this edition<sup>126</sup> and the accompanying commentary.

IV.—Editorial Information: Bibl. 3 and 20.

*V. Early Theologian Works and Calendars (not for publication)*

Amongst my stored writings are also numerous separately stored manuscripts, namely

---

<sup>122</sup> The modification seems to consist in using this manuscript written by a third hand as the preferred manuscript for publication rather than the aforementioned bundle by Schelling.

<sup>123</sup> Fuhrmans: "above."

<sup>124</sup> "+" replaced with "positive" by second hand.

<sup>125</sup> This refers to the dialogue *Clara*.

<sup>126</sup> Fuhrmans: excerpts.



- 1) one still written in Tübingen: On the infancy narrative of Christ.<sup>127</sup> I leave that one to Fritz, who can evaluate whether it would not be of at least historical interest to publish this work.
- 2) an interleaved copy<sup>128</sup> of: “First Outline on a System of Natural Philosophy,” as well as the same for the Journal for Speculative Physics Vol. II, issue 2, which I used for lectures, and extensively annotated and commentated for this purpose. Hardly of use, best if destroyed.
- 3) numerous lectures and booklets I have written myself *a*, on<sup>129</sup> books of the Old Testament<sup>130</sup> (Job, Jeremiah, Psalms, maybe also Isaiah, Proverbs). Original thoughts may be only in the one on Jeremiah and Psalms, that may be used by a descendant. The remaining Schnurrer-notes<sup>131</sup> (namely on the smaller prophets) possibly also useful for a descendant, worth keeping. *b*, on books of the New Testament, partially transcribed<sub>n</sub> (Gospel of John) partially transcribed, partially self-written<sup>132</sup> (Galatians, Romans, Ephesians etc.) Fritz<sup>133</sup> may assess whether something can be learned from the latter—it lacks wholly in real understanding,<sup>134</sup> they are thoroughly rationalistic.
- 4) my calendars extending over many years, containing partially short journal entries, partially notes, excerpts, drafts; hence also original thoughts, much however only half true if not completely false.—Best to be destroyed after review.
- 5) Maybe some other manuscripts in Folio, not mentioned above, on philosophy or philosophical matters—to be destroyed without further ado.

V.—Editorial Information: Bibl. 24, 11 and 7.

V.—Commentary:

---

<sup>127</sup> Underlined by second hand.

<sup>128</sup> In Latin letters, written above by second hand: to be written in German (Sütterlin).

<sup>129</sup> Corrected by second hand.

<sup>130</sup> Underlined by second hand.

<sup>131</sup> A blank space was left in the original and later filled in with the name by second hand. This is a reference to records from sessions from Schelling’s time in Tübingen, which were held by the theologian Christian Friedrich Schnurrer (1742–1822) who was Ephorus of the seminar at the time.

<sup>132</sup> Crossed by second-hand and written above: “so.”

<sup>133</sup> Fuhrmans: The section beginning with “Fritz” has its own subitem c).

<sup>134</sup> “Verständnis” corrected by the first hand to “Verstand.”

Schelling designates his son “Fritz” (K.F.A.), a theologian, to assess whether these theological texts from Schelling’s youth, especially the one on the childhood of Christ, are of worth for either the public [“1”) or distribution within the family [“3)”. For himself, he maintains in “3b)” that the style of commenting on the bible in those earliest years of his was wholly lacking in “real understanding,” as it stemmed from a “thoroughly rationalistic” mindset—“rationalistic” here meaning attempting a philosophical interpretation of biblical episodes based exclusively on the assumption of a rationality-grounded relation between humans and religious content. Schelling notes in retrospect in his historical-critical introduction: philosophy, as it has existed until now, “knows [...] only of rational religion and of a rational relation to God and sees all religious development only as a development of the idea [Idee].”<sup>135</sup>

By that time, Schelling had developed a very different approach: his positive philosophy. This approach takes the biblical episodes to be the legitimate expression of a “real relation of the human consciousness to God.”<sup>136</sup> As such, these episodes mean what they say and are in that sense “tautegorical”<sup>137</sup>—a term Schelling introduces and argues extensively for in the historical-critical introduction. Such a tautegorical interpretation completely changes the character of the testaments of the bible: they are no longer merely popularized ciphers of philosophical reason; they have their own authentic character. They are not a metaphorical veil that covers an actual message and meaning; rather, they themselves convey philosophically relevant content.

## VI. Closing Remarks and Notes on Talks at the Academy in Berlin

Having to manage and even to publish my literary estate, which I unfortunately! failed to do, is a terrible imposition on my sons. *Videant quid possint.*<sup>138</sup> Ulrich, the faithful soul, shall be consulted as well. Above

<sup>135</sup> Richey and Zisselsberger (trans.), *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*, 174 (SW XI: 250–251).

<sup>136</sup> Richey and Zisselsberger (trans.), *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*, 174 (SW XI: 250).

<sup>137</sup> Richey and Zisselsberger (trans.), *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*, 136 (SW XI: 195–196): “[...] everything in it is thus to be understood as mythology expresses it, not as if something else were thought, something else said. Mythology is not allegorical; it is *tautegorical*.” The conception of the “tautegorical” is explicitly adopted by Schelling from the works of Samuel T. Coleridge. See Samuel Taylor Coleridge, “On the Prometheus of Aeschylus,” in *Shorter Works and Fragments. The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* 11/2, ed. Heather Joanna Jackson and James Robert de Jager Jackson (Princeton University Press, 1995), 1251–1301, 1268n1.

<sup>138</sup> “Let them see what they can do.”

all, nothing must fall into the wrong hands! Rather destroyed! Ulrich is also familiar with my latest works and knows how to read my handwriting. He will, I hope, make a neat copy of my talks in front of the Academy of Sciences (in Berlin).<sup>139</sup> Those can, if I don't do it myself, be forwarded straight to printing (not to Mr. v. Cotta, but Perthes in Gotha or Hurter in Schaffhausen or Joseph Max<sup>140</sup> in Breslau)

All correspondences<sup>141</sup> belong to dearest mother, that will outlive me, if not, Paul,<sup>142</sup> who shall decide what to do with each. He shall be consulted in everything, and, regarding practical matters, have the final say, and to whom I hereby transfer the main authority on the overall use of my literary estate.

Berlin, February 1853  
Schelling

## 6. Conclusion

The presentation of the testament and its careful reading and analysis have—we hope—provided sufficient reason in favor of the theses presented in the introduction. In any case, what the facts mentioned in the document prove is that Schelling himself believed in the necessity of the revision of his existing philosophy. What they also strongly suggest is that Schelling's latest philosophy is of a very different structure than anything he had envisioned before.

Furthermore, the testament, together with the attached dictation, leave us with two conclusions regarding this latest philosophy:

- 1) it *does* exhibit a distinct, systematic architecture;
- 2) this latest architecture is significantly different—not only in terms of arrangement, but also in the function of its individual components—from earlier conceptions, such as have been presented in the *Berlin Introduction* (BI).

---

<sup>139</sup> Especially important for present purposes: *On the Source(s) of Eternal Truths* 1850 (SW XI: 573, see bibl. 4.1) and *On Some Compound Adjectives with μᾶ* 1852 (Marbach archive, see bibl. *Manuscripts*).

<sup>140</sup> It is noted in pencil by the second hand but is nearly illegible: “after (?) back to HvC [Mr. Cotta].”

<sup>141</sup> Underlined by second hand.

<sup>142</sup> Underlined by second hand.

Explicitly, Schelling lays out the following order of these architectural components:

1. *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology* (HKE): Justifying religion (and mythology as religion) as a philosophical subject-matter by ultimately tracing the origin of all mythology to the nature of human consciousness and establishing a *tautegorical* approach as the only legitimate way of philosophically harnessing religion.
2. *Philosophical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology or Presentation of the Purely Rational Philosophy* (DRP): Attempting by means of pure reason to grasp the possible objective content of religion as the intended aim of special metaphysics against the background of general metaphysics, as this aim is *a priori* grounded in the principles for all ontic being. Upon failure, realizing negative philosophy can neither grasp real religion nor fulfill the ambition of special metaphysics. This leads to the demand for a positive philosophy by the individual.
  - 2.1. *Source(s) of Eternal Truths* (QEW): Establishing the non-contradictory possibility that if God exists, then, despite Him being ejected from the *purely* rational idea,<sup>143</sup> He could nonetheless be source and principle of all possible *ontic* being.
3. *The Monotheism* (MOT): Conceptual analysis of the historically granted concept of monotheism in order to reidentify the three principles, legitimizing their applicability to all real religion, i.e., mythologies and religions of revelation.
4. *Philosophy of Mythology* (MYL): Beginning positive philosophy: investigating and conceptually ordering actual mythologies through the tautegorical lens in order to substantiate a theogonic process in human consciousness as the best explanation for all of mythology.
5. *Philosophy of Revelation* (PO): Methodological continuation of MYL, now focusing on the phenomena of mysteries and revelation, where the theogonic process is superseded by the spread of personal faith: a belief in a specific act of salvation, which distinctly cannot originate in human consciousness, but only in God.

---

<sup>143</sup> See DRP, SW XI: 566.

## Appendix: Letter, Weinsberg, 12 January 1855—K.F.A. to Waitz<sup>144</sup>

In January 1855, Karl-Friedrich-August Schelling (K.F.A.) was corresponding with Waitz on the edition of Schelling's work. A letter from K.F.A. to Waitz dated January 12th had attached a dictation from Schelling to Paul, by which Schelling gave further instructions on the publication of his latest work. K.F.A. provides the following information on the dictations: "Attached to this letter you can find the program dictated by father to Paul in 1852 which, however, only refers to his *Novissima*." These very "*Novissima*" are what Schelling in the testament calls his newest works, which is why this program is another helpful building block for a correct understanding of Schelling's latest revision—not least because it was made exactly during the time in which Schelling was working so vigorously on the DRP and the (re)arrangement of his metaphysics. The dictation also contains a remark by K.F.A., which indicates, once again, his desire to reduce the content, and, consequently, reduce the importance of the DRP for his father's earlier philosophy.

We provide a complete translation of this appendix containing the dictation from Schelling.

Dictation by the Late Father 1852

### I. Book

Historical-critical Introduction to the *P.[hilosophy] of Mythology*  
Use MS. [manuscript] written by Stort up to the XI lecture.

### II. Book

The purely philosophical, *Presentation of the Purely Rational Phi[losophy]* from lecture [original: Vorles.] XI on: shall remain separated into lectures [original: Vorless.].

Both books can be printed simultaneously after extensive super-revision.

### III. Book

*Monotheism*, partially available under this title. From here on everything else must be deciphered, written as a clean copy and super-revised.

### IV. Book

*Phi[losophy] of Mythology* itself, proceed in the same way.

---

<sup>144</sup> Last page of a letter by K.F.A. to Georg Waitz, from 12 January 1855 (*BAdW-D-Schelling*, Folder 12); see bibl. *Manuscripts*.

## V. Book

*Phi[osophy] of Revelation*. Compare several existing manuscripts [before publishing].

All other booklets, such as the system of the *Ages of World*, *Introduction to the Phi[osophy]*, 8,<sup>145</sup> P.P.<sup>146</sup> may at most be published in parts, only insofar as they contain particularities that contribute an explanation and that are consistent with the rest; book II is to serve as the benchmark [for this consistency].

Everything else, e.g., study on a philos[ophical] dialogue in folio etc., is to be destroyed without further ado, with the exception of the one dictation from the thirties\* in Munich labeled roman E,<sup>147</sup> containing a kind of intr[oduction] to the phi[osophy], which could be printed, if need be. The presentations for the Academy are all ready for printing. The calendars are to be reviewed for anything useful.

\* My own remarks<sup>148</sup>

This MS [manuscript] could be made ready for printing in short notice, roughly 2 months, and it may be very good to insert it between II and III as it has the same subject matter as book II; it, however, uses a different (inductive) method and serves a didactic purpose, which makes it even more helpful for understanding that which is the pure peak of science in II.

---

<sup>145</sup> See Editorial Information (III.k).

<sup>146</sup> See Editorial Information (III.k).

<sup>147</sup> Munich Folio Dictation.

<sup>148</sup> These are not remarks of Schelling's, but are those of K.F.A.'s.

## 7. Bibliography: Schelling's Literary Estate

### Schelling (Texts and Translations) [in alphabetical order]<sup>149</sup>

#### 1. Complete Editions

*Historisch-kritische Ausgabe*. Edited by Thomas Buchheim, Jochem Hennigfeld, Wilhelm G. Jacobs, Jörg Jantzen, and Siegbert Peetz. 35 vols. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1976–. [=AA]

*Sämtliche Werke* [= Schelling's collected works]. Edited by Karl Friedrich August Schelling. 14 vols. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'scher Verlag, 1856–1861. [=SW]

#### 2. Berliner Einleitung (Berlin Introduction)

“Einleitung in die Philosophie der Offenbarung oder Begründung der positiven Philosophie.” In *Philosophie der Offenbarung*. Vol. XIII of SW. 1858: 1–174. [=BI]

→ Schelling, F.W.J. “Schelling's Introductory Lecture at Berlin: 15th Nov., 1841.” Translated by an anonymous translator. *The Dial: A Magazine for Literature, Philosophy, and Religion* 3, no. 3 (1843): 398–404.

→ Schelling, F.W.J. *The Grounding of Positive Philosophy: The Berlin Lectures*. Translated by Bruce Matthews. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 2007.

#### 3: Clara

“Ueber den Zusammenhang der Natur mit der Geisterwelt. Ein Gespräch (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In *1816–1832*. Vol. IX of SW, 1861: 1–110.

→ Schelling, F.W.J. *Clara: or, On Nature's Connection to the Spirit World*. Translated and with an introduction by Fiona Steinkamp. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 2002.

#### 4: Darstellung der reinrationalen Philosophie

“Zweites Buch. Philosophische Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie oder Darstellung der reinrationalen Philosophie.” In *Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie*. Vol. XI of SW, 1856: 253–572. [=DRP]

---

<sup>149</sup> The SW-edition is always listed first (if the text is published in this edition), followed by other editions (especially the *Akademieausgabe*; with § and translations with →). We decided to omit the indication of the editor (and the publisher and the place of publishing) in case of the SW-edition since it is always the same: Schelling's son Karl Friedrich August Schelling, published in Stuttgart at Cotta. We also decided to omit the indication of the publisher and the place of publishing in the case of the AA-edition, for the same reasons.

- Schelling, F.W.J. “Schelling’s Late Political Philosophy: Lectures 22–24 of the Presentation of the Purely Rational Philosophy.” Translated by Kyla Bruff. *Kabiri: The Official Journal of the North American Schelling Society* 2 (December 2020): 93–135.
- “Presentation of the Purely Rational Philosophy (c. 1847).” Translation of sections from lecture 13 by Tyler Tritten. In *The Schelling Reader*, edited by Benjamin Berger and Daniel Whistler, 33–40. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2020.

4.1: *Addendum*: Abhandlung über die Quelle der ewigen Wahrheiten  
 “Über die Quelle der ewigen Wahrheiten.” In *Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie*. Vol. XI of SW, 1856: 573–590. [= QEW]

- Schelling, F.W.J. “On the Source of the Eternal Truths.” Translated by Edward A. Beach. *Owl of Minerva. The Journal of the Hegel Society of America* 22, no. 1 (Fall 1990): 55–67. [Republished in: *The Schelling Reader*, edited by Benjamin Berger and Daniel Whistler. 214–223. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2020.]

5: Darstellung des Naturprozesses

“Darstellung des Naturprocesses (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In *1833–1850*. Vol. X of SW, 1861: 301–390. [Fragment of a lecture from winter semester 1843/44.]

6: Darstellung des philosophischen Empirismus

“Darstellung des philosophischen Empirismus (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In *1833–1850*. Vol. X of SW, 1861: 225–286.

7: Darstellung meines Systems der Philosophie

“Darstellung meines Systems der Philosophie.” In *1800–1802*. Vol. IV of SW, 1859: 105–212.

- First published: Schelling, F.W.J. “Darstellung meines Systems der Philosophie.” *Zeitschrift für speculative Physik* 2, no. 2 (1801): I–XIV and 1–127.
- Schelling, F.W.J. “Darstellung meines Systems der Philosophie.” In *Schriften 1801 “Darstellung meines Systems der Philosophie” und andere Texte*, edited by Manfred Durner, 107–211. Vol. I/10, 1 of AA, 2009.
- Schelling, F.W.J. “Presentation of My System of Philosophy (1801).” In *The Philosophical Rupture between Fichte and Schelling: Selected Texts and Correspondence (1800–1802)*, edited and translated by Michael G. Vater and David W. Wood, 141–205. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 2012. [A part was previously translated by Michael Vater

in “Presentation of My System of Philosophy.” *The Philosophical Forum* 32, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 339–371.]

#### 8: Die Weltalter

“Die Weltalter. Erstes Buch (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In *1811–1815*. Vol. VIII of SW, 1861: 195–344.

- Schelling, F.W.J. *The Ages of the World*. Translated by Frederick de Wolfe Bolman Jr. Columbia University Press, 1942.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *The Ages of the World: (Fragment): From the Handwritten Remains: Third Version (c. 1815)*. Translated by Jason M. Wirth. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 2000.

*Die Weltalter. Fragmente. In den Urfassungen von 1811 und 1813*. Edited by Manfred Schröter. München: C.H. Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966 [first edition: 1946].

- Schelling, F.W.J. “Ages of the world.” Translated by Judith Norman. In Žižek, Slavoj. *The Abyss of Freedom / Ages of The World: An Essay by Slavoj Žižek with the Text of Schelling’s “Die Weltalter” (second draft, 1813)*, 105–182. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *The Ages of the World: Book One: The Past (Original Version, 1811). Plus Supplementary Fragments, Including a Fragment from Book Two (the Present) along with a Fleeting Glimpse into the Future*. Translated by Joseph P. Lawrence. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 2019 [includes some of the fragments published by Grotzsch from the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaft [= BBAW]].

Schelling, F.W.J. *Weltalter-Fragmente*. Edited by Klaus Grotzsch. 2 vols. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2002. [Fragments from BBAW.]

#### 9: Einleitung in die Philosophie (*Introductio in universam philosophiam*)

“D. Frideric. Guil. Joseph de Schelling privatim Introductionem in universam philosophiam tradet. Publicas praelectiones justo tempore indicabit.” In *Initia Philosophiae Universae. Erlanger Vorlesungen WS 1820/21*, edited by Alexander Bilda, Anna-Lena Müller-Bergen, Philipp Schwab. 3 vols., 120–124. Vol. II/10,1 of AA, 2020.

#### 10: Erlanger Vorlesungen

“Erlanger Vorträge (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In *1816–1832*. Vol. IX of SW, 1861: 207–252.

- Schelling, F.W.J. *Initia philosophiae universae: Erlanger Vorlesungen WS 1820/21*. Edited by Anna-Lena Müller-Bergen, Philipp Schwab, and Alexander Bilda. Vol. II/10, 1–3 of AA, 2021 [includes an edition of Schelling’s manuscript archived in Berlin, the SW-edition, the

transcript by Friedrich Leonhard Enderlein, and a transcript by an anonymous author].

- Schelling, F.W.J. *Initia Philosophiae Universae. Erlanger Vorlesung WS 1820/21*. Edited by Horst Fuhrmans. Bonn: H. Bouvier u. Co. Verlag, 1969 [edition of the transcript by Friedrich Leonhard Enderlein].
- Schelling, F.W.J. “On the Nature of Philosophy as Science.” In *German Idealist Philosophy*, edited by Rüdiger Bubner and translated by Marcus Weigelt. 210–243. London: Penguin, 1997 [translation based on SW-edition].

#### 11: Erster Entwurf eines Systems der Naturphilosophie

“Erster Entwurf eines Systems der Naturphilosophie.” In “1799. 1800.” Vol. III of SW, 1858: 1–268.

- First published: Schelling, F.W.J. *Erster Entwurf eines Systems der Naturphilosophie. Zum Behuf seiner Vorlesungen*. Jena und Leipzig: Christian Ernst Gabler, 1799.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *First Outline of a System of the Philosophy of Nature*. Translated and edited by Keith R. Peterson. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 2004.

#### 12: Grundlegung der positiven Philosophie

*Grundlegung der positiven Philosophie: Münchner Vorlesung WS 1832/33 und SS 1833*. Edited by Horst Fuhrmans. Turin: Bottega d’erasmo, 1972.

- “Lectures on the System of Positive Philosophy (1832/3).” Translated by Lydia Azadpour and Daniel Whistler. In *The Schelling Reader*, edited by Benjamin Berger and Daniel Whistler. 197–206. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2020.

#### 13: Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie

“Erstes Buch. Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie.” In *Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie*. Vol. XI of SW, 1856: 3–252.

- Schelling, F.W.J. *Historical-critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology*. Translated by Mason Richey and Markus Zisselsberger. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 2007.

#### 14: Der Monotheismus

“Erstes Buch. Der Monotheismus” In *Philosophie der Mythologie*. Vol. XII of SW. 1857: 3–131.

- Fakhoury, Hadi. *F.W.J. Schelling's Later Philosophy of Religion: A Study and Translation of "Der Monotheismus."* PhD diss., McGill University, Montreal, 2020. [Translation: 155–285.]

#### 15: Philosophie der Kunst

“Philosophie der Kunst (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In “1802. 1803.” Vol. V of SW. 1859: 353–736.

- Schelling, F.W.J. “Philosophie der Kunst” In *Philosophie der Kunst und weitere Schriften (1796–1805)*. Edited by Christoph Binkelman, Daniel Unger, and Alois Wieshuber. 93–405. Vol. II/6,1 of AA, 2018.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *The Philosophy of Art*. Edited, translated, and introduced by Douglas W. Stott. Foreword by David Simpson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

#### 16: Philosophie der Mythologie

*Philosophy der Mythologie*, Vol. XII of SW, 1857.

Publications of earlier Versions of the Philosophy of Mythology (lecture notes, in chronological order):

- Dekker, Gerbrand. *Die Rückwendung zum Mythos*. Munich and Berlin: Verlag von R. Oldenbourg, 1930 [includes sections of a “Kollegheft,” dated 1830/31 by Dekker (cf. 18) but dated 1828/29 by Fuhrmans<sup>150</sup>].
- Schelling, F.W.J. *La philosophie de la mythologie de Schelling: d'après Charles Secrétan (Munich 1835–36) et Henri-Frédéric Amiel (Berlin 1845–46)*. Edited by Luigi Pareyson and Maurizio Pagano. Milano: Mursia, 1991.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *Philosophie der Mythologie: in drei Vorlesungsnachschriften 1837/1842*. Edited by Klaus Vieweg and Christian Danz. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1996 [includes two transcripts from the lecture 1836/37 in Munich, one by Anton Eberz and one by an anonymous author; and one transcript from the lecture in Berlin, 1842, by Andreas von Chovát].
- Schelling, F.W.J. *Philosophie der Mythologie. Nachschrift der letzten Münchener Vorlesungen 1841*. Edited by Andreas Roser and Holger Schulten. Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1996.

#### 17: Philosophie der Offenbarung

*Philosophie der Offenbarung*. Vols. XIII–XIV of SW, 1858.

Publications of earlier versions of the Philosophy of Revelation:

---

<sup>150</sup> Cf. Horst Fuhrmans. *Schellings Letzte Philosophie: Die Negative und Positive Philosophie im Einsatz des Spätidealismus* (Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt Verlag, 1940), 327.

- Schelling, F.J.W. *Urfassung der Philosophie der Offenbarung*. Edited by Walter E. Ehrhardt. 2 vols. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1992.
- Schelling, F.J.W. *Philosophie der Offenbarung: 1841/42*. Edited by Manfred Frank. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977 [based on the transcript by Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus].
- “Lectures on the Philosophy of Revelation (1842/3).” Translated by Bruce Matthews. In *The Schelling Reader*, edited by Benjamin Berger and Daniel Whistler, 207–213 and 277–284. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2020.
- “Lectures on the Philosophy of Revelation (1841/2).” Translated by Joseph Carew and Michael Vater. In *The Schelling Reader*, edited by Benjamin Berger and Daniel Whistler, 381–393. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2020.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *Philosophy of Revelation (1841–42) and Related Texts*. Edited and translated by Klaus Ottmann. Thompson (Conn.): Spring Publications, 2020.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *Schelling’s Philosophy of Mythology and Revelation: Three of Seven Books*. Translated and edited by Victor C. Hayes. Adelaide: Australian Assoc. for the Study of Religions, 1995.

#### 18: Philosophische Entwürfe und Tagebücher

*Philosophische Entwürfe und Tagebücher 1809–1813. Philosophie der Freiheit und der Weltalter*. Edited by Lothar Knatz, Hans Jörg Sandkühler, and Martin Schraven. Hamburg: Meiner, 1994.

*Philosophische Entwürfe und Tagebücher 1814–1816. Die Weltalter II – über die Gottheiten von Samothrake*. Edited by Lothar Knatz, Hans Jörg Sandkühler, and Martin Schraven. Hamburg: Meiner, 2002.

*Philosophische Entwürfe und Tagebücher 1846. Philosophie der Mythologie und reinrationale Philosophie*. Edited by Lothar Knatz, Hans Jörg Sandkühler, and Martin Schraven. Hamburg: Meiner, 1998 [= Calendar 1846].

*Philosophische Entwürfe und Tagebücher 1849. Niederlage der Revolution und Ausarbeitung der reinrationalen Philosophie*. Edited by Martin Schraven. Hamburg: Meiner, 2007 [= Calendar 1849].

#### 19: Propädeutik der Philosophie

“Propädeutik der Philosophie (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In *1804*. Vol. I/6 of SW, 1860: 71–130.

- Schelling, F.W.J. “Propädeutik der Philosophie” In *System der gesamten Philosophie und weitere Schriften (1804–1807)*, edited by Christoph Binkelman and Daniel Unger, 51–98. Vol. II/7, 1 of AA, 2021.

20: Spicilegium observationum in novissimam Arnobii editionem

“Spicilegium observationum in novissimam Arnobii editionem 1818 (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß)” In *1816–1832*. Vol. IX of SW, 1861: 253–300.

21: Stuttgarter Privatvorlesungen

“Stuttgarter Privatvorlesungen (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß)” In *1805–1810*. Vol. I/7 of SW, 1860: 417–484.

- Schelling, F.W.J. *Conférences de Stuttgart = Stuttgarter Privatvorlesungen*. Edited by Miklos Vetö. 2nd ed. Paris: Harmattan, 2009 [Georgii transcripts].
- Schelling, F.W.J. “Stuttgarter Privatvorlesungen” In *Stuttgarter Privatvorlesungen (1810)*, edited by Vicki Müller-Lüneschloss, 61–189. Vol. II/8 of AA. 2017 [Georgii transcripts and SW-version].
- Schelling, F.W.J. “Stuttgart Seminars (1810).” Translated and edited by Thomas Pfau. In *Idealism and the Endgame of Theory: Three Essays*, 195–243. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 1994 [Translation based on SW-edition].

22: System der gesammten Philosophie und der Naturphilosophie insbesondere

“System der gesammten Philosophie und der Naturphilosophie insbesondere (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In *1804*. Vol. VI of SW, 1860: 131–576.

- Schelling, F.W.J. “System der gesammten Philosophie und der Naturphilosophie insbesondere.” In *System der gesammten Philosophie und weitere Schriften (1804–1807)*, edited by Christoph Binkelman and Daniel Unger, 99–443. Vol. II/7, 1 of AA. 2021.
- Schelling, F.W.J. “System of Philosophy in General and of the Philosophy of Nature in Particular (1804).” In *Idealism and the Endgame of Theory: Three Essays*, translated and edited by Thomas Pfau, 139–194. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 1994.
- “System of Philosophy in General and the Philosophy of Nature in Particular (1804).” Translated by Benjamin Berger, Graham Wetherall, Lydia Azadpour, and Daniel Whistler. In *The Schelling Reader*, edited by Benjamin Berger and Daniel Whistler, 98–105, 297–303, 400–402. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2020.

23: System der Weltalter

“Erste Vorlesung in München. (Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß)” In *1816–1832*. Vol. IX of SW, 1861: 355–366.



- *System der Weltalter: Münchner Vorlesung 1827/28 in einer Nachschrift von Ernst von Lasaulx*. Edited by Siegbert Peetz. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1990.

24: Theologische Frühschriften [in alphabetical order]

Ephesians: The Text on the Ephesians is “probably lost” (see AA II/3, 34).

Galatians: “Kommentar zum Galaterbrief (1793).” In *Frühe theologische Arbeiten 1792–1793*, edited by Christian Buro and Klaus Grotzsch, 249–289. Vol. II/4 of AA. 2013.

Gospel of John: “Über das Evangelium Johannis (1790/91).” In *Frühe theologische Arbeiten 1790–1791*, edited by Christopher Arnold and Beatrice Rauschenbach, 25–110. Vol II/3 of AA. 2014.

Jeremiah: “Animadversiones in Jeremiam et Jesaijam (1790/91).” In *Frühe alttestamentliche Arbeiten (1789–1793)*, edited by Christopher Arnold und Michael Hackl, 143–234. Vol II/2 of AA. 2019.

And “Jeremias (1791–1793).” In *Frühe alttestamentliche Arbeiten (1789–1793)*, edited by Christopher Arnold und Michael Hackl, 245–272. Vol II/2 of AA. 2019.

Job: “Kommentar zum Buch Hiob” (1790/1793). Edited by Christopher Arnold and Uta-Marina Danz. AA. Vol. II/1,2, 2020.

On the infancy narrative of Christ: “Proben eines Commentars über die früheste Geschichte Jesu nach Lukas und Matthäus (1793/94).” In *Frühe theologische und philosophische Arbeiten 1793–1795*, edited by Christopher Arnold, Christian Buro, Christian Danz, and Klaus Grotzsch, 123–124. Vol. II/5 of AA. 2016.

Psalms: “Notamina ex praelect. D. Schnvrreri in Psalm. (1789/90).” In *Frühe alttestamentliche Arbeiten (1789–1793)*, edited by Christopher Arnold and Michael Hackl, 21–121. Vol II/2 of AA. 2019.

“Psalmen (1792/93).” In *Frühe alttestamentliche Arbeiten (1789–1793)*, edited by Christopher Arnold and Michael Hackl, 283–358. Vol II/2 of AA. 2019.

Romans: “Animaduersiones ad quaedam loca Epistolae ad Romanos (1792).” In *Frühe theologische Arbeiten 1792–1793*, edited by Christian Buro and Klaus Grotzsch, 37–136. Vol. II/4 of AA. 2013.

Schnurrer-notes (on the smaller prophets): “Über die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten (1790/91).” In *Frühe theologische Arbeiten 1790–1791*, edited by Christopher Arnold and Beatrice Rauschenbach, 123–219. Vol II/3 of AA. 2014.

“Über die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten (1791).” In *Frühe theologische Arbeiten 1790–1791*, edited by Christopher Arnold and Beatrice Rauschenbach, 227–317. Vol II/3 of AA. 2014.

## 25: Über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit

“Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegenstände.” In *1805–1810*. Vol. VII of SW, 1860: 331–416.

- Published first: Schelling, F.W.J. “Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freyheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegenstände.” In *F.W.J. Schellings philosophische Schriften*, Vol. 1, edited by F.W.J. Schelling, 397–511, Landshut: Philipp Krüll, Universitätsbuchhändler, 1809.
- Schelling, F.W.J. “Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freyheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegenstände.” In *Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freyheit’ und andere Texte (1809)*, edited by Christoph Binkelman, Thomas Buchheim, Thomas Frisch, and Vicki Müller-Lüneschloss, 109–179. Vol. I/17 of AA, 2018.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegenstände*. Edited by Thomas Buchheim. 2nd ed. Hamburg: Meiner, 2011.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *Philosophical Inquiries into the Nature of Human Freedom*. Translated by James Gutmann. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company, 2003.
- Schelling, F.W.J. *Philosophical Investigations into the Essence of Human Freedom*. Translated by Jeff Love and Johannes Schmidt. Albany (N.Y.): State University of New York Press, 2006.

## 26: Über die höchsten Principien

Schelling, F.W.J. “Sui principi sommi [Introduzione alla filosofia (Semestre Estivo 1839<sup>151</sup>)]: Trascrizione di Garibald Martin Mittermair.” In *Sui principi sommi = Über die höchsten Principien. Filosofia della rivelazione 1841/42 = Philosophie der Offenbarung 1841/42*, translated and edited by Francesco Tomatis, 474–679. Milano: Bompiani, 2016 [Bilingual edition: German/Italian; transcription by Horst Fuhrmans].

## 27: Zur Geschichte der neueren Philosophie

“Zur Geschichte der neueren Philosophie. Münchener Vorlesungen (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß).” In *1833–1850*. Vol. X of SW, 1861: 1–200.

---

<sup>151</sup> The Mittermair transcript (Manuscript: *BAdW-D-Schelling*, Schelling-Archiv Nr.13) is dated summer semester 1839 here. We believe, however, it might stem from 1837/38 (Cf. Fuhrmans 1972, 38). The lecture given in 1837/38 might be a revised repetition, going back to a lecture held in 1834/35.

→ Schelling, F.W.J. *On the History of Modern Philosophy*. Translated by Andrew Bowie. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

### Manuscripts

Some documents from BBAW are directly accessible via the following link:  
<https://archiv.bbaw.de/online-ausgaben/ausgewaehlte-dokumente-aus-gelehrtenachlaessen>

For other archives: Where publicly and digitally available, links are provided for the individual documents.

#### Testament

Übersicht meines künftigen handschriftlichen Nachlasses (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Universitätsbibliothek, autograph No. 29)

Übersicht meines künftigen handschriftlichen Nachlasses (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 13/1)

### Various Manuscripts [in alphabetical order]

“Andere Deduktion der Prinzipien der positiven Philosophie,’ Abschrift von Stort mit Korrekturen von F.W.J. v. Schelling u. von fremder Hand” (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 97)

“Auszüge aus dem Münchner Folio-Dictat; darin auch Exzerpte und Notizen zu Plato, Aristoteles, Kant’s Rechtslehre, Montesquieu” (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 123 [= Schelling’s notebook titled “1851”])

Course Catalog Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin, summer 1844, 6 (Universitätsbibliothek der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, PA 6466:SH 1840 – SH1858)

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:kobv:11-708771/fragment/page=10>  
“Jahreskalender 1852” (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 73) [=Calendar 1852]

“Jahreskalender 1853” (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 74) [=Calendar 1853]

“Jahreskalender 1854” (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 75) [=Calendar 1854]

“‘Miscellanea,’ mit Ausführungen über Schellings Philosophie der Offenbarung, Ende 1830 Jahre (?)” (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 78) [= K.F.A.’s editorial notes]

“Manuskript zur Vorlesung ‘Einleitung zur Philosophie der Offenbarung oder Begründung der positiven Philosophie,’ hsl. von Stort mit Korrekturen von F.W.J. v. Schelling und von fremder Hand” (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 106) [= Stort’sche Abschrift]

“System der Weltalter WS 1827/28” (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Universitätsbibliothek Munich 4° cod. ms. 1000)

“Ueber [das Wesen der Materie und] eine prinzipielle Ableitung der drei Dimensionen des Körperlichen [gelesen in der Gesamtsitzung der K. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin den 19.Dec. 1850]” (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Nachlass Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling Ana 608.A.3).

“Ueber einige mit ma zusammengesetzte griechische Adjective [Vortrag]” (Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach, 56.1462)

#### Letters [in chronological order]

Conrad Philipp Marheineke to H.G.E. Paulus, 29 November 1842 (Universitätsbibliothek der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, autograph No. 678).

F.W.J. Schelling to Ulrich von Zech, 26 May 1851 (Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Chart. A 2085a I)

F.W.J. Schelling to Hermann Schelling, 14 February 1853 (BBAW-A-Schelling, Nr. 863)

K.F.A. to Georg Waitz, 12 January 1855 (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Ordner 12). [the last page is the *Dictation by the Late Father 1852*]

K.F.A. to Hermann Schelling, Weinsberg 8 July 1855 (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Ana 608.B.III.)



K.F.A. to Hermann Schelling, Weinsberg 8 September 1855 (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Ana 608.B.III.)

K.F.A. to Hermann Schelling, dated "Sonntag Morgen" without exact date (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Ana 608.B.III.) [presumably just after the letter from September 15th 1855]