Appendix XXXVIII

Love. Religion[[1]](#footnote-0)

The ethical attitude and disposition.

1. Establishment of an upper Ego, viewing, judging and volitionally governing the “lower” one as judging in an objectivating way, evaluating, acting.
2. An Ego considering another one (as an *alter ego*), judging, governing, as sympathizing or antipathizing, as raising itself above the other one [423] and his life; to judge and treat it in its life. Phenomenological clarification of both cases. Their relationship. Which is the case of origin.

Love and hate in the absolute sense. Thus not love for another one’s sake, that is, personal love, more clearly: love directed towards persons.

Relation between personal love and personal desire. What this means. One[-sided] love and mutual love. In a certain way love always intends “property”. The one who loves wants to “enjoy” the loved [object]. That is, love as intention and love as fulfillment. Love as being absolutely “determined towards the other one”. What can be meant by that. But brotherly love! Everyone is my neighbor. But not everyone is my friend, my beloved in the special sense. And yet ethic demands brotherly love and love for humanity also in the sense of a certain absolute decision, a practical disposition related to all, practical responsibility, etc. On the other hand, love in the special sense also remains for it [for the ethic]. What do we call this love? A father’s love, a mother’s love, a friend’s love?

Let us only talk of this love individually binding person to persons. Let us say in brief “individually binding love” in contrast to changing sympathy[[2]](#footnote-1), empathetic joy and grief. Can you love yourself in such a way? Be a lover of yourself? Is the ethical subject such a subject, loving and guiding itself as a lover of itself, etc.? Which needs to be expressed in a better way. Doubling of the Ego. The upper Ego firmly, habitually constituted as love and loving will, having an impact on the lower Ego. Insofar as it does this, they “coincide”.

What has the loving one decided for eventually? For the other one and in his beauty eventually. The one who truly loves, insofar as he is a loving one and has a pure impact as such, is beautiful and good himself; he establishes without knowing a purely good and beautiful Ego within himself, within pure love. But how far?

Difference between the inclination to love, love as “decisiveness” of the inclination and decisiveness in actually devotional love, living explicitly within the other one and probably having a practical impact on him as well (marriage, friendship, parental love). Then you truly act as a good subject within the other one. Can you be a good subject in another way, in solitary acting? Does this love, this true love, not make me good myself? How is that? By my becoming a subject loving itself (in the same sense)?

Question: Can I help having an inclination for me? Instinctive decisiveness for me myself. But wrong and true self-love. An upper Ego can again be a bad one. Like I can also sympathize with the bad in the other one. The sinful love for the other one, decisiveness for the other one as a sinful [decisiveness]. And accordingly in relation to me myself. More concise phenomenological analyses!

The love in religious belief.

The divine love living within all subjects loving in the pure sense, in brotherly love and self-love.

The divine love of a father and the being a child of God. The living, evaluating, acting of God’s child, fulfilling the will of God, knowing itself to be guided by him in good and according to his divine will.

Genesis. The way of humanity’s development towards God. The necessary motivation, in which God constitutes himself as “creator of the world” in humanity’s consciousness life, God constituted as the universal principle of an Ego going through all absolute subjects, towards which, as a pole of perfection, all absolute subjects strive passively at first then actively, in such a way that they actualize ever more perfectly the idea of a perfect absolute universe of personalities in this striving. How does the “guiding” final idea need to be grasped in this? As an idea of absolute sociality, that is, all sociality in its perfection? But how is the guiding thing constituted? And what determined constitutive shape does it take on in the development of consciousness (and [in the] social, taken personally one)? It would have a true being in this, a kind of objectivity, and <it would be> still contrasted to all objectivity in the mundane sense.

But can the absolute subjectivity have a beginning, and could this be the end of the matter within the development towards an idea, which shall remain in endless distance? Or else: Is and how is religious experience designed? Does religious experience (self-giving) actually exist? And what does it look like in pure self-giving? What is its content? This would be pure religion as content of a universal religious experience and <of a> religious belief verifying itself from experience.

Then the religious constitutive problems.

1. Breitnau 1924. [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. Habitual sympathy is not binding love yet, an absolutely individual one. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)