

ADAM DROZDEK

SULZER ON THE MAKEUP AND FATE OF SOUL

Abstract. Sulzer, a pastor and also a member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, presented the problem of the immortality of the soul in a naturalist setting. He claimed that the body is indispensable for the soul for its full functioning since without the body, the soul, although perfect, lacks the sensory material coming from the senses and also lacks self-awareness. The soul is one kind of elementary particles with which the creation is filled. In particular, the body, requires the seed which has the program of the orderly development of the body. Since the soul is immortal, virtuous life is necessary for its happy state after the death of the body and the incorporation in a new body.

Key words: Sulzer; the soul; virtue; eschatology.

Johann Georg Sulzer (1720–1779), a scholar and a pastor, believed in the existence of the soul as the substance of a different nature than the body, but he tried to investigate its nature and fate using natural reasoning as much as possible. He believed in God, the Creator of nature who exercised His providential care over the world He created and everything in it, particularly, over human happiness. However, the scientist in Sulzer wanted to present “the immortality of the soul considered physically,” as he entitled in French a series of articles devoted to this issue later published in German as “On the immortality of the soul analyzed as an object of physics.”

THE BODY AND SOUL

Sulzer summarizes his views in five statements. 1. The body, called the animal body, is the seat of the soul, called the animated molecule or particle.

ADAM DROZDEK, PhD — Associate Professor of Computer Science at the Duquesne University, USA; address for correspondence — e-mail: drozdek@duq.edu. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8639-2727>.

2. Due to the power of nature, this soul is indestructible and its makeup remains the same after the death of the body. 3. After the body dies, all sensations and clear presentations of the soul cease and it loses the appearance of a living entity (V 2.5, 77)¹; however, 4. as indestructible, the soul continues to exist in its fullness, unmixed with matter, as a subject of specific natural laws. 5. By these laws, the soul becomes again united with a body and receives again sensations (6, 77).

Sensations take place in the brain, not in sensory organs which only receive impressions. People without a limb can still feel pain in this limb (V 2.7); that is, sensations are possible without receiving impressions from the outside of the soul. Sensation is the work of the soul and thus the brain is the seat of the soul. The body is the source of impressions and also the tool by which the soul acts in the world (10, 22).

The soul retains its perfection/integrity when the body is gone (V 2.15). The soul, “be it material or immaterial,” senses, perceives, judges, desires, detests, etc. (17). In fact, desire and aversion are the two primary instincts of the soul (1.138). The strength of its activity depends on the strength of sensations coming from the senses (2.18). That is, the perfection of the soul does not depend on the influx of impressions and although the level of activity of the soul depends on this influx, the perfection of the soul remains the same at each level of its activity. As the soul is perfect, only through our misconception we ascribe to it any faults. Thus, for instance, someone can hear voices because of mad senses, not because of the madness of the soul. If someone sees a phantom, it is because the phantom was generated by the deranged senses (19).

This is a remarkable claim since it makes senses to be able to generate images which have little or nothing to do with the situation in the surrounding. Sometimes senses can be blamed for a misrepresentation (e.g., seeing a stick in water as bent). Sometimes eyes could be fooled to see a phantom in bad lighting, in configuration of shadows, in arrangement of twigs and leaves of a tree, and the like, but this is the soul that makes a phantom out of it, not the senses. And often a phantom is seen where there is nothing in the surrounding which can provide images even closely resembling it. Sulzer also gave an example of a man caressing a cat thinking that it was his beloved (19). Taking a cat for his beloved? How can anyone

¹ The following references to Sulzer’s works will be used:

A – *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*, vols. 1-2 (Leipzig: M.G. Weidemanns Erben und Reich, 1771-1774).

V – *Vermischte philosophische Schriften*, vols. 1-2 (Leipzig: Weidmanns Erbe und Reich, 1781-1782 [1773]).

see here a mere visual illusion? Sulzer suggested that this was an unhappy lover who expressed thereby his tenderness toward his absent beloved. That would, however, mean that his heart was at fault by influencing the senses to see the beloved in the cat. Well, we probably should not wonder why the beloved could not fall for a man who could mistake a cat for her...

Also, according to Sulzer, children reason as well as adults, but their reasoning abilities appear to be weak because of the weakness of their body. However, their judgment is as good as the judgment of the greatest philosophers and they reason by the same rules as the adults (V 2.20). If so, the education of the children should be limited to the fortification of their bodies to make their judgmental and reasoning abilities to manifest themselves better, since, apparently there is no need to teach them how to reason, how to use logic, how to argue, since these abilities are already inborn. Sulzer, however, admitted that children's reasoning, sharp as that of philosophers, may appear to be inferior since it was based on "relationship of fewer facts" (20), which would mean that their cognitive apparatus is already in place, but they lack information to be garnered through the senses. This might be the meaning of the statement that we come to this world with "general inclinations", with the same powers of the soul and the circumstances give a direction to this undetermined power (1.17) – the circumstances determining the kind of information streaming through the senses to the mind. Sulzer's claim could find support today in the theory of generative grammars that states that all humans have the same inborn linguistic abilities, the same linguistic competence to learn a language, but the circumstances determine which language they actually learn.

The substance of the soul does not change and when the body is damaged, the soul faculties remain the same. Animal body is just a covering of a finer body which is the soul as materialists think and according to those who believe in its immateriality, it is the seat of the soul (V 2.21-22). Thus, for Sulzer, the fact that the soul may be a material entity did not matter too much if its indestructability was not compromised. In fact, it seems that he could even vote for its corporeal character since it would make stronger and more convincing any reasoning based on physics in respect to the soul and its immortality, and thus, all eschatological and ethical consequences of this immortality would be more rooted in science.

Sulzer was not quite consistent in his views about the soul. Early on, he recognized some differences between souls by distinguishing their three types: sharp minds that see the truth easily; sharp imagination: the souls of those who can see the order and beauty in nature; and the souls of those who

have little idea about anything. The first type finds pleasure in metaphysics, the second, in seeing beauty in events, the third in sensory pleasures.² Could just senses be blamed for such a makeup of these souls? Sulzer could claim that education leads to the diminishing effect of the unwanted influence of the senses on the subtlety of the soul, thereby leading to different levels of metaphysical sensitivity of souls.

Indestructability is not limited to souls only. In fact, this is a common phenomenon in nature: “there are material particles that cannot be destroyed by the forces of nature” which maintain their integrity throughout all natural changes. There is a constant disintegration of natural bodies, but there is a lower limit of this dissipation, which is the level of “atoms or elementary particles” (V 2.24). Souls, that is, animated particles, if material, are as simple/indivisible as elementary atoms and thus they are indestructible (33). By this, Sulzer anchored very firmly immortality of the soul in the natural phenomenon of indestructability of material atoms understood in the classical sense as uncut, i.e., indivisible bodies. Instead of limiting the classical argument of the immortality of the soul alone by saying that the soul as a simple/indivisible entity cannot perish, he extended it to the whole of nature by saying that at the bottom, at the level of atoms, nature is characterized by indestructability and thus the soul is also indestructible being an elementary, albeit living, particle. Nature is at the bottom filled with indestructability and the soul is but one element of it.

The body is dissolved into elementary matters (water, air, earth); however, there is no waste in nature; these elementary matters are recycled and used to generate something new (V 2.53). However, how is it possible that the marvelous structure of even the simplest organism comes into being from elementary materials? The making of organized bodies cannot be done by mere mechanical or physical laws (58) and even when proven that each part of plant or animal is made by mechanical causes, it does not mean that the entire organism is so made (65). Sulzer proposed the existence of seeds, materialized organizing principles. “The first organized seeds from which animals arose exist from the beginning of the world being spread everywhere” and thanks to some specific natural laws they continue to exist until right circumstance arise for them to develop into an organism (57). The seed is “an organized body that serves as the foundation, model or form” of the future organism (73).

² J[ohann] G[eorg] SULZER, *Versuch einiger moralischen Betrachtungen über die Werke der Natur* (Berlin: Ambrosius Haude, 1745), 33–34.

Such an idea of preexisting seeds can be found in the Stoics as λόγοι σπερματικοί [*logoi spermatikoi*] and it was also embraced by some Christian theologians to mention Augustine as his *rationes seminales*. Sulzer himself referred to particles of Needham, models or Buffon (V 2.73), and to the epigenesis theory of one Caspar Friedrich Wolff, according to which, however, “the seed was formed through mechanical forces inside the uterus” (69)³. Sulzer, on the other hand, maintained that “the formation of the seed must be ascribed to the cause that is independent from the place where it is being formed.” This cannot be a mechanical, i.e., physical or natural cause (70); thus, it must be supernatural. The seeds have been supernaturally prepared for all individuals (72), and thus there is in Sulzer’s theory some tension between these preexisting seeds and the seeds (be it pollen or semen) that are part of the procreation process. Two seeds, one natural one supernatural? Apparently so, unless it is assumed that the preexisting seed is somehow absorbed by a father before it is passed to a mother. However, Sulzer seems to distinguish the two types of seeds when he said that the omnipresence of the preexisting seeds is *analogical* to tiny seeds of plants (pollen)⁴ and eggs of tiny animals, the eggs transmitted through air (74).

These indestructible seeds are spread everywhere and join the body of a plant or animal through food or otherwise (V 2.74). This means that if these seeds don’t come from a parent, they come from the environment at a certain stage of the development of an organism; that is, the organism apparently can fare quite well in its development at the beginning of its existence without this indestructible seed. At what age — counted in days or years or otherwise — would further development of the organism go awry without this seed?

In any event, there are natural laws which direct proper seeds to proper places in which they can develop because random distribution of seeds would amount to the demise of particular types of organisms (V 2.74).

³ Buffon spoke in the ninth chapter of his *History of animals* about “molécules organiques, toujours actives, toujours subsistantes,” that is, small particles indestructible and unmodifiable used again and again to form new organisms. Cf. a supposition made in the form a question about an indestructible part of an animal, the part endowed with instinct — Pierre Louis MOREAU DE MAUPERTUIS, *Vénus physique* (1745), in his *Œuvres* (Lyon: Jean-Marie Bruyset, 1756), vol. 1, 131-133.

⁴ As he rhapsodized, winds help in fertilization of plants; “they carry kisses and strong embraces of the spouse which break its [plant’s] loneliness and posterity comes into being.” Joh[ann] Georg SULZER, *Unterredungen über die Schönheit der Natur* (Berlin: Haude und Spener, 1770² [1750]), 107.

If these seeds are indestructible, they continue to exist after the death of the body and after the release of the soul. It would then appear that they can be recycled and used for the formation of other organisms. Would the organisms enabled by a particular seed be all the same? Sulzer could use this as an explanation of resemblance of organisms from different generations. Environmental influences would be responsible for some differences between these organisms so that the descendants would not be carbon copies of their predecessors. Some natural laws would have to be responsible for forcing the recycling of seed to be confined to the same family so that the neighbor's progeny would not closely resemble someone from another family which surely would lead to some social tensions.

However, wondrous as the organization of the body can be, it needs an animating principle, the soul. Organization of machines does not give them any powers, only direction. Thus, there must be something outside matter in which active motion is contained (V 1.360).

On the other hand, why does the soul need a body? It appears that perfect as the soul may be, without the body its perfection is at best dormant. One possible reason for the body is that, perhaps, without the body, the soul would receive an infinity of sensations which would confuse it (V 2.49). Also, without the help of bodily organs, the soul can have no clear presentations and no awareness of its own existence (1.374). After death, without the body, the soul does not remain in darkness forever (375). So, being in darkness means being cut off from the influx of sensory material through which the soul receives information from the outside material world. In the incorporeal state should the soul be even unaware of itself? Sulzer said that the soul was an active substance, active by thinking, i.e., by generating and comparing ideas (1.5). However, activity of the soul, i.e., its thinking, is not tantamount to self-awareness: "the activity of our soul is independent from apperception or what Descartes calls consciousness and it can have/exercise its energy even when it is unaware of any sensation/feeling" (352); that is, "the soul can be active without knowing about it" (368). This is a remarkable kind of perfection of the soul that can act mechanically, unconsciously, like an automaton. Today's artificial intelligence would gladly embrace such an idea of perfection: thinking is the constitutive element of the soul, or any intelligent entity, not awareness, the latter being but one possible manifestation of the activity of the soul (367) and "clear consciousness" is merely "an accidental state of the soul" (369).⁵

⁵ That is, "for Sulzer, consciousness is of contingent nature." Udo THIEL, "Sulzer über Be-

It is possible that the soul existed before the body. More likely, it was connected to a body before which could not accept sensory perceptions; this body was later united with a coarser material body (1.375) which enabled sensory perception (376). After death of the body, the soul falls into “a deadly slumber” (V 2.1, 47, 105) — even “eternal slumber” (2) — and must be connected to another body whereby it begins to remember its previous state and develops its abilities. This is how immortality must be represented (377).

We can be active not being aware of it nor having about it a clear idea (V 1.369), e.g., in sleep or when fainted (1.370). Stronger yet, consciousness disappears during sleep which shows that the soul feels itself only through the body (2.204-205). The claim is not altogether certain. When the soul dreams (surely, the body does not), is that tantamount to the lack of awareness? If a person wakes up in sweat because of a bad dream, this can hardly be the case of the lack of awareness during this dream and the lack of feeling. Mostly we forget about the dreams at the moment of waking up, but this does not mean that we come to the state of self-awareness from the state of its lack. We appear to be as keenly self-aware during sleep as in the waking state, sometimes even more so, even though the memory of what was experienced during in sleep evaporates. It seems that although, on the one hand, Sulzer said that in sleep, which is an image of death, the soul is inactive and unconscious (2.26), on the other hand, he stated that while dreaming, the soul “rises and all its faculties manifest themselves in all their strength” (37). Also, in the state of detachment from the body, the soul – Sulzer just surmised since “the inner nature of the soul is not sufficiently known to us” — the soul can think and reason. It is only cut off from perception, sensory perception, that is, which can only be provided by the body (2.47).

Since the soul needs the body to blossom, for its perfection to be animated, it is possible that the next body the soul acquires will be of the same order as the body before, and why limit the soul to two or three bodies only? In fact, Sulzer stated that because his soul was in his body, it was first in some little body and then it transferred to his current body (1.375). It is,

wusstsein im Kontext,” in *Johann Georg Sulzer (1720–1779). Aufklärung zwischen Christian Wolff und David Hume*, ed. Frank Grunert and Gideon Stiening (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011), 29. Sulzer thus allowed the existence of the soul without the body even though it was only “the soul without sensitivity nor consciousness banned into ‘the darkness’.” Helmut HOLZHEY, “Die Berliner Popularphilosophie. Mendelssohn und Sulzer über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele,” in *Schweizer im Berlin des 18. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Martin Fontius and Helmut Holzhey (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1996), 213.

however, unclear, when the soul came into being. At the creation of the world when it was temporarily housed in some little body? Thus, the metempsychosis can very easily be incorporated into Sulzer's system. Almost certainly it was not his intension. It seems that in his explanation the pastor in Sulzer had his eyes also on the Christian eschatology according to which human immortality is the immortality of the soul united with the new body resurrected into eternal perfection. However, since he wanted to keep his explanations on the naturalistic level, he did not refer, not explicitly, to revelation. This revelation thus appears to be an unspoken background for his reflections on the fate of the soul — the animate particle — after the death of the body.

The indestructability of elementary particles was one, the most naturalistic, line of defense of the immortality of the soul, although the supernatural aspect was allowed when speaking about the fact of existence of seeds. Another proof was based on the need of perfecting the soul and ultimately on the goodness of God.

Sulzer said that perfect intellectual happiness was impossible without very wide knowledge and readiness of thinking (V 1.330). This would mean that it has to be life after life when this knowledge can grow to the sufficient level of perfection, or maybe this is an unending process, after death, while humans will still be finite beings; thus, the infinity of knowledge will always be an unachievable goal since infinity cannot even be fully embraced by finitude. The realm of truth is limitless, the sea without bottom from which rational beings draw new ideas; they will never end in their growth of perfection (341). It is impossible for a finite being to be perfectly happy because of its nature, not because of the attributes of the infinite Being. This nature does not allow the finite being to reach the level of perfection (335) needed for perfect happiness without preceding stages with the presence of pleasure and pain. This is based on experience and on attributes of God that prohibits the thought that can be a better state of the world than it is now (336). That is, the goodness and perfection of God is the ultimate argument underlying the prospect of eternal life: good God just could not create rational, feeling beings to end their lives in unhappiness and imperfection. Moreover, we have to recognize necessarily the Maker of nature and from investigation of His work with full certainty we know His character or essence and from which we make conclusions about the future.⁶ That is, the

⁶ [Johann Georg SULZER], "Anmerkungen," in David HUME, *Philosophische Versuche über die menschliche Erkenntniß* (Hamburg: Georg Christian Grund und Adam Heinrich Holle, 1755), 339.

physico-theological investigations so pronounced in Sulzer's works, have eschatological value: the investigation of nature, its orderliness, its harmonious makeup point to the Creator and His goodness, and this goodness must necessarily extend to the lives of rational beings including humans.

Incidentally, since this life is an antechamber of the afterlife, what is this afterlife? Sulzer must have reflected on this issue at some length considering his poor health and lengthy bouts of illness which brought him to the threshold of death. In one letter he wrote, "I feel every day the work that gnaws on my life and I must constantly be prepared to the voyage to the other world. The carriage stands packed before the door and I only wait for the last sign of departure."⁷ However, Sulzer had very little to offer in his presentation of the future life. He accepted Leibniz' continuity principle whereby he stated that in this world there are imperceptible borderlines between various types of beings and extended this beyond this world expressing his conviction that there is an infinite number of levels of spiritual beings whose goal, just as the goal of men, is to know God (10.156). Before, Sulzer thought about himself that he was among the most perfect creations of God, but now he could see how he had deceived himself (13.159): "I am certain now that I am among the countless many creature one of the most lowly" (14.160). These countless creatures perhaps one day would unite with God and he would be among them (15.160).⁸ Hence, proud fools are those who think that the world was created only for their own sake (54.198).⁹

VIRTUE

The immortality of the soul has everlasting consequences for each person. Therefore, children should be told about the immortal soul and the afterworld where people live happily or unhappily according to how they lived here.¹⁰ This, of course, should be done not just to provide factual information, but to prompt children to conducting their lives so that the end of life will be a welcome prospect, not a dreaded fate. Therefore, children

⁷ *Briefe der Schweizer Bodmer, Sulzer, Geßner*, ed. Wilhelm Körte (Zürich: bei Heinrich Geßner, 1804), 430.

⁸ Sulzer referred here to Eph. 1:20, which speaks about elevating Christ to the heavenly places, but nothing about infinite hierarchy of spiritual beings or the union of humans with them in God.

⁹ SULZER, *Versuch einiger moralischen Betrachtungen*, 10, 13, 14, 15, 54.

¹⁰ [Johann Georg SULZER], *Versuch von der Erziehung und Unterweisung der Kinder* (Zürich: Conrad Orell und Comp., 1748), 233.

should be encouraged to live the life of virtue. The process does not start with a clean slate: “the valuable seeds of virtue were planted by benevolent hand in our soul” in form of an inclination to virtue (V 1.93). Thus, virtue “is one of the first acts of nature,” virtue being the readiness to bring happiness to oneself and to others (94). However, virtue has to be brought to the fore: at its origin, virtue is an inclination to do out of knowledge and reason what a wild man does out of instinct (1.291). It appears that virtue exercised instinctively would be less effective than when done in full awareness of its importance. Moreover, the participation of intellect is necessary since without it virtue is not a virtue. It would appear that virtuous acts exercised unreflectively will not be counted as such by the person who performs them. Even stronger, children should not only know virtue, but love it. This requires 1. enlightened intellect that clearly sees duties and knows reasons by which the will can be directed, and 2. good will for which obstacles are lifted. With enlightened intellect, the will necessarily be leaning toward goodness and love of virtue will follow.¹¹

Virtue still has value without the recognitions of an infinitely perfect Creator and of a future life after death (V 1.332). However, the recognition of these two truths he considered to be the only foundation of the peace of mind and the belief in the Creator to be powerful incentive for a person to strive for virtue.¹² In case of doubt, the argument from the wise order of the world and from the hope that the truth and virtue are the only avenues promising the lasting progress toward true peace and happiness can be used. The prospect of the future is the only thing that gives value to the entire creation.¹³ That is, virtue is done for the good of others and of oneself even though life were limited to this earth. However, it is not, and therefore it is so important to instill in children the need of a virtuous life using the prospect of the future life as an incentive. In this, fine art can be of immense help.

In his work, Sulzer devoted considerable attention to the theory of art for which he is primarily known today. His first books were devoted to physico-theological investigations which is reflected in the way he viewed art as a handmaid of morality. Art was invaluable in shaping the moral dimension of the human personality.

¹¹ SULZER, *Versuch von der Erziehung*, 78, 79, 85.

¹² Stronger yet, “virtue without piety — something in the sense of the Stoics — is for him an empty word.” Hans WILL, *Johann Georg Sulzer: Persönlichkeit und Kunstphilosophie* (St. Gallen: Buchdruckerei Ostschweiz, [1954]), 13.

¹³ SULZER, “Anmerkungen,” 333.

In Sulzer's view, what nature does, should also be the goal of fine arts. By acting at our senses, nature allures us to the good and scares us away from evil (A 611a). Through the beauty and ugliness nature teaches us about the good and evil (610b). Fine arts should beautify human works just as nature beautifies the works of creation (611a). Beauty is everywhere in nature as a sign of goodness and so fine arts use beauty "to draw our attention to goodness and touch us with the love for it" (612b). Only fine arts can show any virtue in full glory (613b). Fine arts are "the only means to fill the disposition of man with leaning toward all [that is] beautiful and good, to make truth active and virtue enticing, to prompt people toward goodness and to keep them from harmful enterprises" (619a). Art thus can have enormous sway over people. The artist, "the one whom Muses love, like another Orpheus, will bring people with tender and kind compulsion, even against their will, to eager execution (613b) of everything that is necessary for their happiness" (614a). However, this is only when artists themselves are imbued with proper moral disposition. Thus, there is no automatism here. And so, Sulzer praised Greek art since "the Greeks had the right concept of fine arts that namely it should serve the purpose of the building of morals and the support of philosophy and even of religion" (619b). Convinced that "the main goal of fine arts is the awakening of active feelings of truth and goodness" (21a), and thus they should foster the moral dimension of man.¹⁴ Sulzer had harsh words for those who misdirected the artistic endeavor. For him, the artist working only for an amusement of imagination does not imitate nature, he is a monkey (V 1.145).

Visual and auditory senses affect the spirit and the heart. In these two senses is the mainspring of rational and moral behavior (A 781a). And thus, poetry is helpful when it serves religion and virtue. Epic poems speak about virtues. Good epic poems are the most important work of human intellect in comparison with which Egyptian pyramids are trifles. The poet should encourage the reader to follow virtue.¹⁵ The expression or portrayal of moral character is the most important occupation of art and particularly the most prominent gift of poets," whereby poets can positively influence the forces of the soul (A 195a). As to the visual arts, "as the young man is prompted through the power of beauty to love

¹⁴ Sulzer required from fine arts "that they implant well-ordered, commanding inclinations which determine the moral character of man and his moral value." Ludwig Maximilian HEYM, *Darstellung und Kritik der ästhetischen Ansichten Johann Georg Sulzers* (Leipzig: Oswald Schmidt, 1894), 44.

¹⁵ J[ohann] G[eorg] S[ULZER], *Gedanken von dem vorzüglichen Werth der epischen Gedichte des Herrn Bodmers* (Berlin: [s.d.], 1754), 9–12,

which embraces his entire soul, so the power of expression [of paintings] fills each feeling person with the wonderment of the grandeur, with the love of goodness, and with the horror of evil” (105b).¹⁶

Just as scholarly research of nature, just as the school education of children are enlisted in the interest of promoting and shaping the moral life of each person, so are also fine arts,¹⁷ whereby the educational aspect of arts becomes prominent.¹⁸ Morality becomes the central tenet of each life since morality through a virtuous life leads to eternal happiness. Therefore, in all areas of life, more or less directly, eschatology is what counts the most, since the life in eternity is at stake and for Sulzer, as for any believer in the reality of such a life, hardly can anything be more important.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Briefe der Schweizer Bodmer, Sulzer, Geßner*, edited by Wilhelm Körte. Zürich: bei Heinrich Geßner, 1804.
- GROSS, Karl Josef. *Sulzers Allgemeine theorie der schönen Künste*, Berlin: Ebering, 1905.
- HEYM, Ludwig Maximilian. *Darstellung und Kritik der ästhetischen Ansichten Johann Georg Sulzers*. Leipzig: Oswald Schmidt, 1894.
- HOLZHEY, Helmut. “Die Berliner Popularphilosophie. Mendelssohn und Sulzer über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele.” In *Schweizer im Berlin des 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Martin Fontius and Helmut Holzhey, 201–215. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1996.
- LEO, Johannes. *Johann George Sulzer und die Entstehung seiner Allgemeinen Theorie der schönen Künste. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Aufklärungszeit*. Berlin: Kommissionsverlag von Ernst Frensdorff 1907.
- LEQUAN, Mai. “Esthétique et morale selon Kant et Sulzer: la *Théorie générale des beaux-arts* et la *Critique de la faculté de juger*.” In *L’esthétique de Johann Georg Sulzer (1720-1779)*, edited by Bernard Deloche, 147–212. Lyon: Université Jean-Moulin Lyon 3, 2007.

¹⁶ “The ethical tendency and thus the highest goal of art in general is cultivated in the kind of painting.” Karl Josef GROSS, *Sulzers Allgemeine theorie der schönen Künste* (Berlin: Ebering, 1905), 60.

¹⁷ “For Sulzer, esthetics has a moral finality, fine arts have moralizing goal. The moral virtue and the rectitude of morals are in effect the ultimate essence and the final cause of fine arts.” Mai LEQUAN, “Esthétique et morale selon Kant et Sulzer: la *Théorie générale des beaux-arts* et la *Critique de la faculté de juger*,” in *L’esthétique de Johann Georg Sulzer (1720-1779)*, ed. Bernard Deloche (Lyon: Université Jean-Moulin Lyon 3, 2007), 184.

¹⁸ “Through all writings of Sulzer always shimmers the vocation of an educator, undoubtedly the strongest side of his talent.” Johannes LEO, *Johann George Sulzer und die Entstehung seiner Allgemeinen Theorie der schönen Künste. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Aufklärungszeit* (Berlin: Kommissionsverlag von Ernst Frensdorff, 1907), 34. Sulzer “was no esthetician ... he was more pedagogical and moralistic nature.” Fritz ROSE, “Johann Georg Sulzer als Ästhetiker und sein Verhältnis zu der ästhetischen Theorie und Kritik der Schweizer,” *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* 10 (1907): 261.

- ROSE, Fritz. "Johann Georg Sulzer als Ästhetiker und sein Verhältnis zu der ästhetischen Theorie und Kritik der Schweizer." *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* 10 (1907): 197–262.
- SULZER, Johann Georg. "Anmerkungen." In David HUME. *Philosophische Versuche über die menschliche Erkenntniß*. Hamburg: Georg Christian Grund und Adam Heinrich Holle, 1755.
- SULZER, Johann Georg. *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*. Vols. 1-2. Leipzig: M.G. Weidmanns Erben und Reich, 1771-1774.
- SULZER, Johann Georg. *Gedanken von dem vorzüglichen Werth der epischen Gedichte des Herrn Bodmers*. Berlin: [s.d.], 1754.
- SULZER, Johann Georg. *Unterredungen über die Schönheit der Natur*. Berlin: Haude und Spener 1770² [1750].
- SULZER, Johann Georg. *Vermischte philosophische Schriften*. Vols. 1-2. Leipzig: Weidmanns Erbe und Reich, 1781-1782 [1773].
- SULZER, Johann Georg. *Versuch einiger moralischen Betrachtungen über die Werke der Natur*. Berlin: Ambrosius Haude, 1745.
- SULZER, Johann Georg. *Versuch von der Erziehung und Unterweisung der Kinder*. Zürich: Conrad Orell und Comp., 1748.
- THIEL, Udo. "Sulzer über Bewusstsein im Kontext." In *Johann Georg Sulzer (1720–1779). Aufklärung zwischen Christian Wolff und David Hume*, edited by Frank Grunert and Gideon Stiening. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011.
- WILI, Hans. *Johann Georg Sulzer: Persönlichkeit und Kunstphilosophie*. St. Gallen: Buchdruckerei Ostschweiz, [1954].

SULZER O NATURZE I LOSIE DUSZY

Streszczenie

Sulzer, pastor, a także członek berlińskiej Akademii Nauk, przedstawił problem nieśmiertelności duszy w ujęciu naturalistycznym. Twierdził, że ciało jest niezbędne dla duszy do pełnego jej funkcjonowania, ponieważ bez ciała dusza, chociaż doskonała, nie ma dostępu do materiału pochodzącego od zmysłów, a także pozbawiona jest samoświadomości. Dusza jest rodzajem cząstek elementarnych, którymi wypełniony jest świat. W szczególności ciało wymaga ziarna, które zawiera program ustrukturuwanego rozwoju ciała. Ponieważ dusza jest nieśmiertelna, cnotliwe życie jest konieczne do jej szczęśliwego stanu po śmierci ciała i jej połączenia się z nowym ciałem.

Słowa kluczowe: Sulzer; dusza; cnota; eschatologia.