4

KANT IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Robert Hanna

Introduction

Alfred North Whitehead (1861–1947) quotably wrote in 1929 that "the safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato."[1] The same could be said, perhaps with even greater accuracy, of the twentieth-century Euro-American philosophical tradition and Immanuel Kant (1724–1804).[2] In this sense the twentieth century was the post-Kantian century.

Twentieth-century philosophy in Europe and the USA was dominated by two distinctive and (after 1945) officially opposed traditions: the *analytic tradition* and the *phenomenological tradition*. Very simply put, the analytic tradition was all about logic and analyticity,[3] and the phenomenological tradition was all about consciousness and intentionality.[4] (See also "The birth of analytic philosophy," Chapter 1; "The development of analytic philosophy: Wittgenstein and after," Chapter 2; "American philosophy in the twentieth century," Chapter 5; and "Phenomenology," Chapter 15.) Ironically enough however, despite their official Great Divide, both the analytic and the phenomenological traditions were essentially continuous and parallel critical developments from an earlier dominant neo-Kantian tradition. This, by the end of the nineteenth century had vigorously reasserted the claims of Kant's transcendental idealism against Hegel's absolute idealism and the other major systems of post-Kantian German Idealism, under the unifying slogan "Back to Kant!" So again ironically enough, both the analytic and phenomenological traditions were alike founded on, and natural outgrowths from, Kant's Critical Philosophy.

By the end of the twentieth century however, and this time sadly rather than ironically, both the analytic and phenomenological traditions had not only explicitly rejected their own Kantian foundations and roots but also had effectively undermined themselves philosophically, even if by no means institutionally. On the one hand the analytic tradition did so by abandoning its basic methodological conception of analysis as the process of logically decomposing propositions[5] into conceptual or metaphysical "simples," as the necessary preliminary to a logical reconstruction of the same propositions, and by also jettisoning the corresponding idea of a sharp, exhaustive, and

significant "analytic-synthetic" distinction. The phenomenological tradition on the other hand abandoned its basic methodological conception of phenomenology as "seeing essences" with a priori certainty under a "transcendental-phenomenological reduction," and also jettisoned the corresponding idea of a "transcendental ego" as the metaphysical ground of consciousness and intentionality.

One way of interpreting these sad facts is to say that just insofar as analytic philosophy and phenomenology alienated themselves from their Kantian origins, they stultified themselves. This is the first unifying thought behind this chapter, and it is a downbeat one. The second unifying thought, which however is contrastively upbeat, is that both the analytic and phenomenological traditions, now in conjunction instead of opposition, could rationally renew themselves in the twenty-first century by critically recovering their Kantian origins and by seriously re-thinking and re-building their foundations in the light of this critical recovery. Or in other words: *Forward to Kant.*

A sketch of Kant's Critical Philosophy

What the Critical Philosophy is

Not surprisingly, Kant's Critical Philosophy is to be found primarily in his three *Critiques*: the *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781–7), the *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788), and the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (1790). But the Critical Philosophy is not exhausted by the *Critiques*. Kant's *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics* (1783), *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science* (1786), and *Jäsche Logic* (1800) all complement and supplement the first *Critique*; his *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785), *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone* (1793), and *Metaphysics of Morals* (1797), similarly complement and supplement the second *Critique*; and his *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (1798) and the unfinished and posthumously published *Transition from the Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science to Physics* (also known as the *Opus postumum*) together make up his final Critical reflections on human reason and physical nature.

But what *is* the Critical Philosophy? In a word, *it's all about us.* Less telegraphically put, the Critical Philosophy is a comprehensive theory of human nature, carried out by means of detailed analyses of human "cognition" (*Erkenntnis*), human volition or "the power of choice" (*Willkür*), and human "reason" (*Vernunft*). Cognition, volition, and reason are all "faculties" (*Vermögen*), which in turn are innate, spontaneous mental "capacities" (*Fähigkeiten*) or "powers" (*Kräfte*). The innateness of a mental capacity means that the capacity is intrinsic to the mind, and not the acquired result of experiences, habituation, or learning. Correspondingly, the spontaneity of a mental capacity implies that the acts or operations of the capacity are

1 causally and temporally unprecedented, in that (a) those specific sorts of act or operation have never actually happened before, and (b) antecedent events do not provide fully sufficient conditions for the existence or effects of those acts or operations,

2   underdetermined by external sensory informational inputs and also by prior desires, even though it may have been triggered by those very inputs or motivated by those very desires,

3   creative in the sense of being recursively constructive, or able to generate infinitely complex outputs from finite resources, and also

4   self-guiding.

Cognition is a faculty for the conscious mental representation of objects (*CPR* A320/376–7). Volition, or the power of choice, is a faculty for causing actions by means of conscious desires (MM 6: 213). And reason is a faculty for cognizing or choosing according to "principles" (*Principien*) (*CPR* A405, A836/B864 and *CPrR* 5: 32), which are necessary and strictly normative rules of the human mind or human action, and constitute either theoretical laws or practical laws. Theoretical reason is cognizing that is aimed at the *truth of judgments*, according to necessary and strictly normative rules of logic and in particular according to the Law of Non-Contradiction, which says that only those propositions that are not both true and false, can be true. Practical reason by contrast is choosing that is aimed at either *the instrumental good of actions* or *the non-instrumental good of actions*. The latter arises according to strictly normative rules of morality and in particular according to the unconditional universal moral law or Categorical Imperative, which says that only those chosen acts whose act-intentions, when generalized to every possible rational agent and to every possible context of intentional action, are internally consistent and also coherent with the general aims of rational agents as such, can be morally good.

What makes the Critical Philosophy a specifically *critical* philosophy, however, is Kant's striking and substantive thesis – which amounts to a mitigated form of rationalism – to the effect that the human faculty of reason, whether theoretical or practical, is inherently constrained by the brute fact of human finitude, or our animality. Otherwise put, Kantian critique is the philosophical story of how our reason, which initially aims to occupy the standpoint of God through theoretical speculation and practical aspiration alone, rationally reconciles itself to cognitive and moral life in a messy material world. More precisely, this is to say that our capacity of reason finds itself inherently constrained by the special contingent conditions of all human animal embodiment: the faculties of "sensibility" (*Sinnlichkeit*), and "desire" (*Begehren*) or "drive" (*Trieb*). In what ways constrained? The answer is that human sensibility strictly limits our theoretical reason to the cognition of sensory appearances or phenomena, and that human desire or drive strictly limits our practical reason to choices that are bound up with our psychophysical and psychosocial well-being, or "happiness" (*Glückseligkeit*). So rational creatures like us are nevertheless *inherently human*, and indeed *all-too-human*:

> Human reason has this peculiar fate in one species of its cognition that is is burdened with questions which it cannot dismiss, since they are given to it as problems by the nature of reason itself, but which it also cannot answer, since they transcend every capacity of human reason. (*CPR* Avii)

> Out of the crooked timber of humanity, nothing straight can ever be made.
> (IUH 8: 23)

By sharp contrast, the theoretical reason of a divine cognizer, or "intellectual intuition" (*CPR* B72), is (barely) conceivable by us; and such a being would know "things-in-themselves" or objective "noumena," that is, supersensible Really Real objects whose essences are constituted by mind-independent intrinsic non-relational properties (*CPR* A42–9/B59–72, B306–7), directly and infallibly by thinking alone. Similarly, the practical reason of a divine agent or "holy will" (*GMM* 4: 439), which is a *subjective* noumenon, is also (again, barely) conceivable by us; and such a being would do the right thing directly and infallibly by intending alone. Kant thinks that we cannot help being able to conceive such beings, and that an essential part of our rational intellectual and moral make-up is the fact that we are finite embodied beings who burden ourselves with invidious comparative thoughts about these non-finite non-embodied beings. We crave a transcendent, superhuman justification for our finite embodied thoughts and actions. So for Kant, to be human is not only *to be* finite and embodied, and also *to know* that we are finite and embodied, but most importantly of all, *to wish that we weren't.*

Kant's metaphysics

On the theoretical side of the rational human condition, this inherent anthropo-centric limitation specifically means that human cognition is sharply constrained by three special conditions of sensibility: two formal conditions, namely the necessary a priori representations of space and time (*CPR* A38–9/B55–6); and one material condition, namely affection, or the triggering of cognitive processes by the direct givenness of something existing outside the human cognitive faculty (*CPR* A19/B33). The basic consequence of these constraints is *transcendental idealism*. Transcendental idealism, as the name obviously suggests, is the conjunction of two sub-theses: (1) *the transcendentalism thesis*, and (2) *the idealism thesis.*

    (1) The transcendentalism thesis says that all the representational contents of cognition are strictly determined in their underlying forms or structures by a set of primitive or underived universal a priori innate spontaneous human cognitive capacities, also known as "cognitive faculties" (*Erkenntnisvermögen*). These cognitive faculties include (i) the "sensibility" (*Sinnlichkeit*), or the capacity for spatial and temporal representation via sensory "intuition" (*Anschauung*) (*CPR* A22/B36), (ii) the "understanding" (*Verstand*), or the capacity for conceptualization or "thinking "(*Denken*) (*CPR* A51/B75), (iii) the power of "imagination" (*Einbildungskraft*), which on the one hand comprehends the specific powers of "memory" (*Gedächtnis*, *Erinnerung*) (A 7: 182–5), "imaging" (*Bildung*), and "schematizing" (*CPR* A137–42/B176–81), but also on the other hand includes the synthesizing or mental-processing power of the mind more generally (*CPR* A78/B103), (iv) "self-consciousness" (*Selbstbewußtsein)* (*CPR* B132) or the capacity for "apperception," which is the ground of unity for all conceptualizing and judging (*CPR* B406), and finally (v) reason, which as we have

already seen is the capacity for logical inference and practical decision-making. The whole system of cognitive capacities is constrained in its operations by both "pure general logic," the topic-neutral or ontically uncommitted, a priori, universal, and categorically normative science of the laws of thought, and also by "transcendental logic," which is pure general logic that is semantically and modally restricted by an explicit ontic commitment to the proper objects of human cognition (*CPR* A50–7/B74–82).

(2) The idealism thesis says that the proper objects of human cognition are nothing but objects of our sensory experience – appearances or phenomena – and not things-in-themselves or noumena, owing to fact that space and time are nothing but necessary a priori subjective forms of sensory intuition (Kant calls this "the ideality of space and time"), together with the assumption (which I will call *the intrinsicness of space and time*) that space and time are intrinsic relational properties of every object in space and time (*CPR* A19–49/B33–73, A369 and *P* 4: 293). Appearances, in turn, are token-identical with the intersubjectively communicable contents of sensory or experiential representations (*PC* 11: 314). Correspondingly, the essential forms or structures of the appearances are type-identical with the representational forms or structures that are generated by our universal a priori mental faculties: "objects must conform (*richten*) to our cognition" (*CPR* Bxvi), and "the object (as an object of the senses) conforms to the constitution of our faculty of intuition" (*CPR* Bxvii).

Putting transcendentalism and idealism together, we now have the complex conjunctive Kantian metaphysical thesis of transcendental idealism:

> Human beings can cognize and know only either sensory appearances or the forms or structures of those appearances – such that sensory appearances are token-identical with the contents of our objective sensory cognitions, and such that the essential forms and structures of the appearances are type-identical with the representational forms or structures generated by our own cognitive faculties, especially the intuitional representations of space and time – and therefore we can neither cognize, nor scientifically know,[6] nor ever empirically meaningfully assert or deny, anything about things-in-themselves. (*CPR* A369, B310–11)

This is of course is a highly controversial and substantive metaphysical thesis. But Kant both mitigates the sting and enriches the substance of his idealism by also defending *empirical realism*:[7]

> [The] empirical realist grants to matter, as appearance, a reality which need not be inferred, but is immediately perceived (*unmittelbar wahrgenommen*). (*CPR* A371)

> Every outer perception … immediately proves (*beweiset unmittelbar*) something real in space, or rather [what is represented through outer perception] is itself the real; to that extent, empirical realism is beyond doubt, i.e., to our outer intuitions there corresponds something real in space. (*CPR* A375)

In other words, he is saying that when we eliminate things-in-themselves as possible objects of human sensible cognition (although we remain capable of *thinking* about them abstractly), focus exclusively on appearances instead, and then identify *them* with the real material objects in space, it follows that we perceive real material objects in space through our senses without any further intermediary (let us call this Kant's *direct perceptual realism*), and also that all the essential properties of real material objects in space are macrophysical directly perceivable or observable properties (let us call this Kant's *manifest realism*). In other words, for Kant the classical "veil of mere appearances" becomes *the field of authentic appearances*, in which all things are precisely what they seem to be. In this sense, his idealism is also paradoxically the most robust realism imaginable.

But what is the *point* of transcendental idealism? Kant's immensely brilliant answer, worked out in rich (and occasionally stupefying) detail in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, is that transcendental idealism alone adequately explains how synthetic a priori propositions – that is, non-logically necessary, substantively meaningful, experience-independent truths – are semantically possible or objectively valid (*CPR* B19), and also how human freedom of the will is both logically and metaphysically possible (*CPR* Bxxv–xxx, A530–58/559–86). His two-part thought in a nutshell is this:

(1) The *synthetic apriority thesis* says that all and only empirically meaningful synthetic a priori propositions express one or more of the transcendental conditions for the possibility of our human experience of objective appearances.

(2) The *transcendental freedom thesis* says that the synthetic a priori proposition (call it "*F*") – which says that human noumenal (aka "transcendental") freedom of the will exists – *cannot be scientifically known to be true*. Yet (a) *F* is logically consistent with the true synthetic a priori proposition (call it "*G*"), which says that the total mechanical system of inert macrophysical material bodies in phenomenal nature – bodies that are in fact constituted by fundamental attractive and repulsive forces under natural laws – have deterministic temporally antecedent nomologically sufficient causes; (b) the actual truth of G underdetermines the truth value of *F*; (c) both the metaphysical possibility and the actual truth of *F* are presuppositions of human morality.

If the synthetic apriority thesis is true, it follows that there are two irreducibly different kinds of necessary truth, namely analytic or *logical* necessities and synthetic or *non-logical* necessities (which I will call Kant's *modal dualism*), and that the first principles of metaphysics are among those synthetic or non-logical necessities. It also follows that the set of first principles of metaphysics, and the set of truths about how our transcendental cognitive faculties make a priori contributions to the formal structures of sensory representations, are one and the same. And if the transcendental freedom thesis is true, it follows that the law-governed mechanism of nature is not only *consistent* with human freedom of the will, but also implies the *necessary possibility* of human freedom in nature.

This shows us that the ultimate upshot of Kant's metaphysics is thoroughly anthropocentric and practical.[8] Otherwise put, Kant fully rejects scientific or reductive naturalism, which says that science – more precisely, *exact science*, or mathematics-plus-physics – is, as Wilfrid Sellars famously formulates it, "the measure of all things."[9]

On the contrary, for Kant scientific reductionism leads directly to both epistemic and moral skepticism (*CPR* xxix). Moreover, for Kant, by a fundamental explanatory inversion or "Copernican Revolution," exact science is grounded on the transcendental metaphysics of rational human nature. But it gets even better than this. In order to allow for the possibility of human freedom, he also holds that we must sharply *limit* the epistemic and metaphysical scope of exact science: "I have therefore found it necessary to deny *scientific knowing* (*Wissen*) in order to make room for [moral] *faith* (*Glauben*)" (*CPR* Bxxx). Indeed, practical reason has both explanatory and ontological *priority* over theoretical reason (*CPrR* 5: 120–1). So, perhaps surprisingly, the key to Kant's metaphysics is his ethics.

Kant's ethics

On the practical side of the rational human condition, the intrinsic constraints on human volition are in certain ways highly analogous, but also in other ways sharply disanalogous, to the intrinsic constraints on human cognition. Like human cognition, whose proper objects are restricted to sensory appearances, so too the proper objects of human volition are *desiderative appearances*, or *things that seem desirable or good to the rational human animal*, and thus are bound up with its individual and social well-being or happiness. For Kant, this directly implies that rational human animals are *radically evil* (*Rel* 6: 32–3). Despite our being *fallible* or error-prone creatures however, this does not mean that rational human beings are *fallen* creatures, whether in the theological (Christian) sense of original sin, or in the secular (Rousseauian) sense of an inevitable corruption by socialization.[10] What it means instead is the much more prosaic fact that in the developmental order of time rational humans are *human animals* long before they are able to actualize their capacity for reason (*Rel* 6: 26–7), and are therefore subject to the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to; and even once human beings do finally become mature adults and actualize their rational capacity, nevertheless in order to survive and flourish as animals in an often unfriendly and dangerous world that they did not create and did not ask to be born into, they must as a matter of contingent fact *almost* inevitably think and act prudentially. Therefore rational humans will – not necessarily but as a matter of contingent fact *almost* inevitably, given their profound vulnerability to sheer luck and their partially constitutive animality – freely choose things, by virtue of the power of choice inherent in their animal nature (*MM* 6: 213), in violation of the moral law (*CPrR* 5: 100).[11]

The moral law, or Categorical Imperative – that is, an unconditional universal rational command – is our duty or strict obligation as rational animal beings or persons, and says that we ought to do only those acts whose "maxims" or act-intentions (1) can be consistently universalized, (2) always involve treating other persons as "ends-in-themselves," or as having *intrinsic value*, and never merely as means to the satisfaction of our own desires, (3) inherently express our pure rational volitional nature as free or causally spontaneous and also autonomous or self-legislating agents, and (4) directly imply our belonging to an indefinitely large ideal community of persons and free and autonomous agents, "the kingdom of ends," the card-carrying members of which can

self-legislate the moral law only insofar as they *also* legislate for every other member of the self-same ideal moral community (GMM 4: 406–45).

Now according to Kant the Categorical Imperative provides a universal unconditional non-instrumental reason for human action (as specified in particular unconditional non-instrumental reasons, constructed by us in particular act-contexts) in the form of a rational command, and is to be sharply contrasted with *hypothetical* imperatives either of "skill" or "prudence," which are conditional instrumental rational commands and thereby provide conditional instrumental reasons for human action: such as that I ought to flip the light switch in order to turn on the light (imperative of skill), or that I ought to bring the glass up to my lips if want to drink my tot of Jack Daniel's (imperative of prudence). But the Categorical Imperative, in and of itself, does not tell us *which* maxims or act-intentions to form but rather but rather only *how* we must form maxims in order to be morally good. So the Categorical Imperative is a purely *procedural* or *constructive* principle of human volition and action (exactly analogous to the Law of Non-Contradiction in relation to the truth of theoretical judgments and the soundness of arguments), and not a *substantive* or material principle that in and of itself yields maxims. This means that practical reasoning must always begin with actual human desires and hypothetical imperatives as inputs or data, and then, if the moral law is to be heeded, suitably constrain intentional animal action by choosing to act only on those maxims that satisfy the four formulations of the Categorical Imperative. The recognition of our obligation and ability to constrain intentional animal action appropriately, when concretely realized and non-cognitively consciously experienced via some characteristically moral feelings such as self-respect, self-denying concern for others, moral disgust, or righteous anger, is what Kant calls the "Fact of Reason" (*CPrR* 5: 31). Most crucially, the Fact of Reason yields direct affective, non-conceptual, and non-propositional (hence non-cognitive, non-scientific, and non-theoretical) *compelling empirical evidence* for the actual existence of transcendental freedom and practical freedom (*CPR* A802/B830).

So, unlike empirically meaningful human cognition, which can never even in principle transcend the bounds of sensibility (*CPR* A42–3/B59–60), the rational human animal still *does* possess the capacity for practical freedom or autonomy, which is a spontaneous causally efficacious capacity for self-legislative choosing in a way that is underdetermined by all alien causes and prudential concerns, and in self-conscious conformity with the Categorical Imperative (*CPrR* 5: 28–33). In other words, autonomy is rational freedom of the pure "will" (*Wille*) (MM 6: 213–14). No matter how infrequent such choices are, to exercise rational freedom of the will is to realize the rational practical aspect of our human nature, and to that extent, transcend the intrinsic constraints on human volition, or our animality. So, paradoxically, we rationally transcend ourselves only when we fully come to terms with our animality. We are immediately conscious of the fact that (or in any case *we must act under the idea that*) autonomy or practical freedom of the will actually exists, because (1) freedom of the will is (as an online capacity) a necessary and (as an implemented capacity) sufficient condition of moral responsibility and (2) rational human animals are, as a social matter of fact, held morally responsible for their right and wrong intentional

actions alike (*GMM* 4: 446–63). Or more succinctly put: the *ought* and *ought not* of morality alike entail the *can* of rational volitional human agency, or the autonomously and practically free will.

This power of autonomy is to be sharply contrasted with the "power of choice" (*Willkür*) (*CPR* A802/B830 and *CPrR* 5: 97), shared by human animals and non-human animals alike, which is *not necessarily* autonomous and therefore has no sufficient connection with moral responsibility. Yet, whenever the power of choice is realized in a rational animal, this implies at least a transcendentally free causal responsibility and thus remains a necessary condition of autonomy and moral responsibility. No rational human animal can be practically free and operate independently of all alien causes and sensuous motivations unless it can *also*, just like any other conscious animal, move itself by means of its desires in a way that is strictly underdetermined by the universal mechanism of the causal laws of inert material nature – or in other words, move itself *animately, purposefully, and freely*. And in this way, according to Kant, the *inertial* causal dynamics of mechanical matter is radically extended by the *vital* causal dynamics of embodied moral persons.

Neo-Kantian openings

What neo-Kantianism is

Neo-Kantianism[12] in all its forms was a German philosophical movement that ran its course from roughly 1870 to roughly 1945. It consisted in the close study and passionate promulgation of Kant's Critical Philosophy plus some editorial changes and critical updates, whereby certain troublesome concepts and doctrines (for example, things-in-themselves and their metaphysical status) were omitted or finessed, and whereby certain themes (for example, Kant's psychology, his idealism, or his philosophy of the exact sciences) were specially emphasized and further developed. The unifying slogan "Back to Kant!" was the motto of Otto Liebmann (1840–1912) in his *Kant und die Epigonen* (1865). Other leading neo-Kantians included Alois Riehl (1844–1924), Hermann Cohen (1842–1918), Paul Natorp (1854-1924), Heinrich Rickert (1863–1936), and Ernst Cassirer (1874–1945).

Neo-Kantianism and the emergence of analytic philosophy

Neo-Kantianism carried over into the early twentieth century in three significantly different versions: (1) a *science-oriented* neo-Kantianism (mainly centered in Marburg) that was fueled by contemporary developments in the exact sciences, together with classical empiricism in the tradition of David Hume (1711–76) and John Stuart Mill (1806–73); (2) a *psychologistic* neo-Kantianism (mainly centered in Göttingen) that reacted against science-oriented neo-Kantianism and fused with empirical psychology; and (3) an *idealistic* neo-Kantianism (mainly centered in Heidelberg) that merged with elements of the dominant Hegelian tradition. Psychologistic neo-Kantianism led to *phenomenology*. Idealistic neo-Kantianism led to *neo-Hegelianism*. And science-oriented neo-Kantianism led to *logical positivism*.

By the end of the twentieth century, analytic philosophy comfortably dominated the Anglo-American philosophical scene, and analytic philosophers were the Establishment.[12] But at the beginning of the century things were very different: the dominant philosophies in English-speaking countries and Europe alike were neo-Kantianism or neo-Hegelianism, and analytic philosophers were the Young Turks. Analytic philosophy emerged in the period from the *fin de siècle* to the mid-1930s by means of, on the one hand, a sharp reaction against neo-Kantianism and neo-Hegelianism, which pulled it in the direction of Platonism and radical realism, and on the other hand, the anti-metaphysical impetus provided by logical positivism, which, rather confusingly, also pulled analytic philosophy simultaneously in the opposite direction of conventionalism and anti-realism. This inner conflict in the foundations of analytic philosophy between Platonism and realism on the one side, and conventionalism and anti-realism on the other, later worked itself out in the historical-philosophical careers of the paired concepts of *the analytic proposition* (a necessary a priori truth by virtue of logical laws and logical definitions – or perhaps "meanings" – alone) and *analysis* (the process of knowing an analytic proposition). There will be more to say about these important notions below. The crucial point at the moment is that they make sense only in relation to a neo-Kantian and thereby Kantian backdrop. Without Kant's Critical Philosophy, *there would have been no such thing as analytic philosophy*.[13]

Now back to exploring the influence of psychologistic neo-Kantianism, and the emergence of phenomenology.

Kantian themes in the early phenomenological tradition

Kant, Brentano, and the foundations of phenomenology

Phenomenology, according to its founder Franz Brentano (1838–1917) in his *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* (1874), is "descriptive psychology."[14] This contrastively refers back to Kant's Paralogisms, where he thoroughly criticizes *rational* psychology, which claims that the mind is a simple substantial immortal Cartesian soul, or a subjective thing-in-itself (*CPR* 341–405/B399–432). In other words, rational psychology is the a priori science of *mental noumena*. By sharp contrast, descriptive psychology in Brentano's sense is the a posteriori science of *mental phenomena*. Brentano's mental phenomena are essentially the same as the contents of what Kant called "inner sense," and what William James (1842–1910) later called "the stream of consciousness" or "stream of thought."[15] More precisely, mental phenomena are occurrent apparent facts about the human activity of consciously representing objects, which Brentano dubbed (following the Scholastics) *intentionality*. Intentionality is a necessary and sufficient condition of mental phenomena.[16] Another necessary and sufficient condition of mental phenomena is *inner perception*, which is an immediate, infallible, self-evident knowledge about intentional facts.[17] Brentano's notion of inner perception in turn corresponds to what Kant called "empirical apperception" (*CPR* B132), with the crucial difference that unlike Brentano he does not suppose that

empirical apperception is either immediate (because for Kant it is always mediated by concepts), infallible (because for Kant it is merely contingent cognition), or certain (because for Kant it is merely empirical cognition).

According to Brentano, every act of intentionality – every mental phenomenon – has an intentional object or "immanent objectivity." Intentional objects in turn have the ontological property of "inexistence" or *existence-in*, which means that their being necessarily depends on the being of the act of intentionality itself. So for Brentano the act of intentionality literally *contains* its intentional objects as intrinsic contents. Consequently, an intentional object cannot also exist outside the mind, as a thing-in-itself. It is therefore equivalent to what Kant called an "appearance" (*Erscheinung*).[18] When an intentional object is represented spatially or by means of what Kant called "outer sense," whether or not it is presented as actually extended in space (as, for example, in the case of the visual experience of color, which sometimes is directed proximally to phosphenes – the tiny phenomenal fireworks you experience when you close your eyes and press your fingers on your eyelids – and not distally to colored surfaces), then it is what Brentano calls a "physical phenomenon."[19]

Brentano's notion of phenomenology is therefore, with one crucial exception, the same as Kant's notion of empirical psychology, The crucial exception is that whereas for Kant empirical psychology can never be a genuine science – that is, an a priori discipline whose basic claims are necessarily true, law-governed, and known with certainty – owing to the non-mathematizable and idiosyncratically subjective character of its subject matter (*MFNS* 4: 470–1), by contrast for Brentano phenomenology is a genuine empirical science founded on first-person epistemic self-evidence and certainty. This lingering Cartesian assumption of a "privileged access" to mental phenomena implies, in effect, their intrinsic non-relationality, logical privacy, infallibility, ineffability, and immediate apprehensibility[20] in Brentano's phenomenology – something that would have been thoroughly rejected by Kant. The assumption of privileged access has fundamental significance for the phenomenological tradition. For to the extent that it is retained, it entails that *phenomenology* is always teetering on the edge of *phenomenalism*.

Kant, Husserl, phenomenology, and philosophical logic

Husserlian phenomenology began as philosophical logic. Edmund Husserl (1859–1938), in his first book, *Philosophy of Arithmetic: Psychological and Logical Investigations*, *Vol. I* (1891), applied Brentano's phenomenology to arithmetic cognition. But unfortunately he also committed the cardinal sin of *logical psychologism*: the explanatory reduction of the necessary, a priori, and universal subject matter of logic to the contingent, a posteriori, and relativized subject matter of empirical psychology. This sin was very helpfully pointed out to him in a devastating book review by Gottlob Frege.[21] Husserl too quickly came to doubt his own approach and, as a result, the second volume of the *Philosophy of Arithmetic* never appeared.

In the first volume entitled *Prolegomena to Pure Logic* (1900) of his second book (*Logical Investigations*, 1900/1), Husserl expiated his sin and also indirectly obtained

a suitable revenge against Frege. He did this by working out a lengthy, rigorous, and radical critique of logical psychologism in the context of a strongly rationalistic – and officially anti-Kantian – conception of pure logic, thereby becoming the leading German philosopher of logic, and completely outshining Frege on the contemporary scene. Husserl's official anti-Kantianism – "for even transcendental psychology *also* is psychology"[22] – is misleading, however. This is because Kant in actual fact explicitly rejected logical psychologism in the first *Critique* (*CPR* A52–5/B77–9). So the real issue between Kant and Husserl about logic has to do with whether pure logic has a "transcendental" foundation in Kant's sense (that is, whether pure logic fundamentally depends on the spontaneous mental processing abilities of our innate a priori cognitive capacities), or not. This was not resolved until Husserl decisively opted for the Kantian doctrine in his later *Formal and Transcendental Logic* (1929).

In any case the *Prolegomena* was published as the first volume of an even bigger book, *Logical Investigations*, in which, equally brilliantly and remarkably, Husserl directly applied Brentano's phenomenology to foundational topics in philosophical logic: meaning, pure logical grammar or syntax, mereology (the logic of parts and wholes, closely related to both property-theory and set-theory), the nature of intentional content of all sorts, propositions and judgment-acts, truth, and propositional knowledge. Nevertheless Brentano was not the only or even the primary influence on Husserl's approach to philosophical logic. In the first (1901) edition of *Logical Investigations*, as Husserl explicitly admitted in the second (1913) edition, "I spoke of 'pure grammar', a name conceived and expressly devised to be analogous to Kant's 'pure science of nature'."[23] Husserl also introduced an importantly new idea about intentionality that was a significant advance over Brentano's doctrine: namely, a sharp and explicit distinction between (1) the subjectively conscious "lived experience" (*Erlebnis*) or act (*Akt*) of intentionality (2) the objectively existing and intersubjectively shareable logical or semantic *content* (*Inhalt*) of intentionality, and (3) the mind-independent *objective reference* (*objektive Beziehung*) of intentionality. More precisely Husserl showed how, while each of these is an intrinsic feature of every intentional mental state, each component can nevertheless vary logically independently of the other. Ironically enough, in contemporary writings Frege also systematically developed essentially the same distinction[24] between what he calls (1*) the subjective "idea" (*Vorstellung*) or attitudinal "coloration" (*Farbung*), (2*) "sense" (*Sinn*), and (3*) "reference" (*Bedeutung*). Nevertheless, if the truth be told, both Husserl and Frege were merely recurring to Kant's threefold distinction, made explicitly in and throughout the first *Critique*, between (1**) the phenomenal "matter" (*Materie*) of inner sense (its subjectively experienced attitudes, desires, feelings, sensations, and images), (2**) the "intension" (*Inhalt*) of concepts (their "sense" or *Sinn*) and judgments (their propositional content or *Satz*), and (3**) the "reference" (*Beziehung*) of intuitions (their individual objects) and concepts (their "comprehension" or *Umfang*).

There is however a fundamental meta-philosophical tension in *Logical Investigations*. This tension is that Brentano's phenomenology, as a descendant of Kant's empirical psychology, is at bottom factual and empirical, while Husserl's phenomenology is irreducibly modal, non-empirical, and non-logical. Husserl's response to this tension

is to reinterpret Brentano's notion of self-evident inner perception as a priori *insight* (*Einsicht*) or a priori *self-evidence* (*Evidenz*).[25] So for Husserl phenomenology has an a priori foundation, and its basic truths are synthetically necessary and a priori.

It may then seem that Husserl is back safely in the Kantian fold of transcendental psychology. Nevertheless there is another problem. Brentano's phenomenology has no rational soul as a subjective foundation, but instead only a functional unity of human intentional activities, and Husserl had explicitly adopted this conception of the phenomenological ego in the first edition of *Logical Investigations*: "I must frankly confess, however, that I am quite unable to find this ego, this primitive, necessary centre of relations [to the contents of experience]."[26] But by the second edition, Husserl explicitly realized that this would not suffice for an epistemic foundation of his apriorist version of phenomenology, and that he had to upgrade to a higher-order ego: "I have since managed to find [this ego], i.e., have learnt not to be led astray from a pure grasp of the given through corrupt forms of the ego-metaphysic."[27] In other words, he managed to find a Kant-style *transcendental ego* to ground his logical epistemology.

Kant, Husserl, and transcendental phenomenology

According to Husserl in his *Idea of Phenomenology* (1907), *Ideas I* (1913), and *Cartesian Meditations* (1931), finding a transcendental ego requires a special philosophical effort, or more precisely a series of such efforts.[29] Recall that the function of a transcendental ego for Husserl is to ground his a priori rationalist phenomenological epistemology. And a transcendental ego in the Kantian sense is not a Cartesian mental substance, but instead an innate spontaneous non-empirical cognitive capacity for self-consciousness. So the nature of a transcendental ego must be such that the act of self-conscious reflection suffices for the knowledge of the propositional content of intentionality. This in turn requires (1) that this propositional content be guaranteed to true, and (2) that this content be grasped by the thinking subject with self-evidence. And *that* in turn requires (1*) that this propositional content be materially identical with the truth-making object of the proposition, and also (2*) that the form of this propositional content be immediately and infallibly apprehended by the thinking subject.

Husserl secures condition (1*) by means of what he calls "the transcendental-phenomenological reduction." This treats the logical or semantic content of intentionality (now dubbed the "noema," as opposed to the "noesis," which is the intentional act) as *identical to* the objective reference of intentionality, and is therefore broadly equivalent to Kant's breathtaking fusion of transcendental idealism and empirical realism. But there is a subtle difference. Whereas Kant had argued for both his transcendental idealism and empirical realism theses via his thesis of the transcendental ideality of space and time, Husserl takes a different route, which he rather unhelpfully calls by the Greek term *epoché*, and only slightly more helpfully calls "abstention" (*Enthaltung*), "bracketing" (*Einklammerung*), and "putting out of play" (*außer spiel zu setzen*). The basic idea goes back to Brentano's idea of an inten-

tional "presentation" of an object and to Husserl's own corresponding notion of a "mere presentation" in the Fifth Logical Investigation: it is one thing to represent an object or state-of-affairs *as actually existing*, and another thing altogether to represent it merely *as possibly not existing*. Given Cartesian skeptical doubts, the object possibly does not exist. Assuming that this possibility obtains in the actual world, then all that remains for the thinking subject of intentionality is the logico-semantic *presentational content* which represents the object in a certain way. So this logico-semantic presentational content becomes the new or indirect object of intentionality. Frege discusses essentially the same idea under the rubric of the "indirect reference" of meaningful expressions in "opaque" contexts – that is, ordinary referring expressions falling within the scope of certain psychological verbs followed by propositional complements, such as "believes that" or "wonders whether," and so-on – although without the Cartesian and Kantian metaphysical backdrops assumed by Husserl. What the parallel with Frege shows is that transcendental idealism and empirical realism do not automatically *follow* from the transcendental-phenomenological reduction, but must in fact be a further metaphysical hypothesis added by Husserl in order to guarantee the truth of the propositional content to which the truth-making object has been "reduced."

Correspondingly, Husserl secures condition (2*) by means of what he calls "seeing essences" (*Wesensschau, Wesenserschauung*) and "eidetic intuition." Despite the allusion to the Platonic *eidos* however, seeing essences is not supposed by Husserl to be Platonic insight, or a mysterious infallible grasp of mind-independent, non-spatio-temporal, causally inert, universal, ideal objects; nor is it supposed to be Leibnizian insight, or the infallible, certain, clear and distinct awareness of innate ideas. Instead it is *Kantian* insight, which is a reflective awareness of just those formal elements of representational content that express the spontaneous transcendental activity of the subject in synthesizing that content: "reason has insight only into what it itself produces according to its own design" (*CPR* Bxiii). So Kantian insight is a special form of self-knowledge. More specifically, Kantian insight includes elements of conceptual "decomposition" (*Zergliederung*), of pure "formal intuition" (*formale Anschauung*), and also of the "figurative synthesis" or "transcendental synthesis of the imagination" or "*synthesis speciosa*" (*CPR* A5/B9, B151, B160 n.).

The crucial point of contrast with Husserl's eidetic insight however, is Kant's fallibilistic thesis that insight yields at best only a subjective sufficiency of belief or "conviction" (*Überzeugung*), but not, in and of itself, objective "certainty" (*Gewißheit*) (*CPR* A820–2/B848–50). The world must independently contribute a "given" element, the manifold of sensory content, in order for knowledge to be possible (*CPR* B145). Husserl, by sharp contrast, takes eidetic insight to be infallible and certain, which again shows his troublesome tendency to run together Kantian transcendental idealism/empirical realism, which is explicitly anti-Cartesian, and Cartesian epistemology, which entails a corresponding Cartesian metaphysics of substance dualism. Descartes's epistemology is forever haunted by skepticism, and Descartes's dualism of mental substance (whose essence is *thinking*) and physical substance (whose essence is *extension*) is forever haunted by the unintelligibility of mind–body interconnection and interaction. The phenomenological tradition would have been much better off if *Cartesian Meditations* had been *Kantian Reflections*.

Kant, Heidegger, and the analytic of Dasein

But phenomenology did not end with Husserl. The reactionary Cartesian elements of Husserl's transcendental phenomenology were arrested and sent to the wall by his revolutionary student Martin Heidegger (1889–1976), in his groundbreakingly brilliant and occasionally bumptious book *Being and Time* (1927). The result is a transcendental phenomenology of direct intentionality, in which the human being – now somewhat unhelpfully dubbed Dasein or "being-there" – finds that the intentional content of her intentional mental acts is no longer locked up inside her pineal gland but instead literally spread out into her local spatial environment and into her larger social and historical world, and either wholly or at least partially dynamically determined in time by her skillful practical engagement with that environment and that world. From our vantage point, it is easy enough to see how Heidegger's new conception of human intentionality and his corresponding "analytic of Dasein" is essentially Kant's theory of spatio-temporal intuition in the Transcendental Aesthetic and of empirical judgment in the Transcendental Analytic, now ingeniously turned inside out so that the representation of time essentially spreads itself onto the representation of space, *plus* Kant's conception of an embodied human practical reasoner. The Kantian grounds of Heidegger's phenomenology are explicitly worked out in his *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason* (1927–8).[28]

In short, Heidegger is a *radical Kantian externalist* about intentional content. But he is also an *existential Kantian pragmatist* about intentional content. For he posits an irreducibly non-conceptual practical element in perceptual intentionality by treating it as the directly engaged and attentively absorbed skillful manipulation of a fundamentally usable commonsense world. Correspondingly he treats propositional linguistic intentionality as a form of "interpretation" (*Auslegung*) or worldly hermeneutics based on a projective "understanding" (construed now in the gerundive form of *Verstehen*, as opposed to Kant's noun-substantive *Verstand*) whereby meaning is essentially contextually determined.[29]

This in turn implies that the classical accounts of perception and empirical judgment, as the sense-datum-mediated and logically mediated quasi-pictorial representations of a microphysically real material thing-in-itself of modern natural science, are both deeply misleading. Perception and judgment for Heidegger are worldly human performances in a world of self-manifesting or cognitively accessible, fundamentally usable appearances, and *not* passive mirrorings of a set of colorless, valueless, intrinsic non-relational, essentially hidden or cognitively inaccessible, fundamentally physical properties.[30]

Heidegger's other deeply important Kant-inspired phenomenological innovation was to emphasize spontaneous affect, feeling, and volitional action over passive sensation and sensa (or phenomenal qualia) in intentionality, and thereby to construe consciousness and cognition alike as irreducibly emotive, active, and normative. For this reason he calls object-directed intentionality "concern" (*Bekümmerung*). This revolutionary Kant-driven Heideggerian re-working of the mind/world relation is, in turn, deeply similar in many ways to John Dewey's contemporary and independent development of radical externalist pragmatism in *Experience and Nature* (1929).

It is significant that like Husserlian phenomenology, Heideggerian phenomenology also began as philosophical logic. In his 1913 doctoral thesis, *The Theory of Judgment in Psychologism*, Heidegger isolated the logico-semantic question, "What is the sense (or point) of sense?" ("*Was is der Sinn des Sinnes?*") as a fundamental philosophical problem. The other fundamental philosophical problem animating Heidegger in the years prior to *Being and Time* was the question, "What is the being (or essence) of being?," something which had obsessed him ever since he had read Brentano's *On the Several Senses of Being in Aristotle* as a precocious Gymnasium student in 1907. From 1909 to 1911 he closely studied Husserl's *Logical Investigations*, and began to identify logico-semantic issues with ontological issues. So, first philosophy for early Heidegger was the phenomenological analysis of *logic, meaning, and the world*. This is clearly a recurrence to the basic themes of Kant's transcendental logic in the Metaphysical Deduction of the Pure Concepts of the Understanding (*CPR* A66–83/B91–116). It is also precisely where the twentieth-century analytic tradition begins. Indeed, Heidegger's second published work in philosophy was *Neuere Forschungen über Logik* [*New Investigations in Logic*] (1912), a sympathetic survey of contemporary logical theory, including the first volume of Bertrand Russell's and A. N. Whitehead's *Principia Mathematica* (1910). As we saw in above, analytic philosophy and phenomenology alike were the natural progeny of the Kantian tradition; and as we will see below, they did not have a genuine falling-out until *after* 1945. Like most fallings-out between siblings, the inside story is interestingly complicated.

Kantian themes in the early analytic tradition

What analytic philosophy is

The analytic tradition is based on two core ideas: (1) that all necessary truth is logical truth, which is the same as analytic a priori truth, and that there are no non-logical or non-analytic necessary truths (the thesis of *modal monism*), and (2) that all a priori knowledge is knowledge of analytic truths and follows directly from the process of (2.1) logically decomposing analytic propositions into conceptual or metaphysical simples which are mind-independently real yet immediately and infallibly apprehended with self-evidence, and then (2.2) rigorously logically reconstructing those propositions by formal deduction from (a) general logical laws and (b) premises that express logical definitional knowledge in terms of the simple constituents (the thesis of *a priori knowledge as decompositional analysis*).[33]

Both core ideas are explicitly anti-Kantian. For Kant holds (1*) that there are two irreducibly different kinds of necessary a priori truth, namely (a) logically or analytically necessary a priori truths, and (b) non-logically or synthetically necessary a priori truths (the thesis of *modal dualism*), and (2*) that a priori knowledge can be directed to either analytically or synthetically necessary a priori truths, but in either case (as we have seen already above) this knowledge stems essentially from a reflective awareness of just those formal elements of representational content that express the spontaneous transcendental activity of the subject in cognitively synthesizing or mentally processing that content (the thesis of *a priori knowledge as self-knowledge*).

So what *is* analytic philosophy? The simple answer is that analytic philosophy is what Frege, G. E. Moore, Russell, and Rudolf Carnap did for a living after they rejected Kant. The subtler answer – because it includes the major contribution of Ludwig Wittgenstein – is that analytic philosophy is *the rise and fall of the concept of analyticity* (see "The development of analytic philosophy: Wittgenstein and after," Chapter 2).

Frege was undoubtedly the founding grandfather of analytic philosophy, by virtue of his bold and brilliant attempt to reduce arithmetic systematically to pure logic, whose theorems are all analytic,[34] and thereby demonstrate (1) that Kant was miserably mistaken in holding that all arithmetic truth and knowledge is synthetic a priori, and (2) that arithmetic proof is a fully rigorous and scientific enterprise. This is the beginning of the project of *logicism*, which Russell, Whitehead, Wittgenstein, and Carnap all pursued in the first three decades of the twentieth century. Logicism provides the first half of modal monism. The second half of modal monism is provided by the rejection of the very idea of a synthetic a priori proposition. This was the unique contribution of Wittgenstein and Carnap, via the Vienna Circle (*Wiener Kreis*) and logical positivism, in the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century. Frege himself held, like Kant, that geometry is synthetic a priori.[35]

Kant, Moore, and the nature of judgment

In view of Frege's partial Kantianism, G. E. Moore (1873–1958) was in fact the founding father of philosophical analysis. Paradoxically however, Moore invented analysis not so much by writing about it, as instead by *living it*, that is, by virtue of his passionately and relentlessly deploying the method of of decompositional analysis in his early philosophical writings,[36] and by the powerful influence of his charismatic philosophical personality on Russell and Wittgenstein.[37]

Moore began his philosophical career as a psychologistic neo-Kantian, and wrote his fellowship dissertation on Kant for Trinity College, Cambridge, under the direction of the equally neo-Kantian and Brentano-inspired philosophical psychologist James Ward (1843–1925),[38] who had previously been Moore's undergraduate supervisor and mentor at Trinity. But like other young philosophers with minds of their own – and, ironically enough, quite like the early Husserl in relation to Brentano – Moore vigorously rejected the teachings of his teacher. Moore's specific act of rebellion against his mentor Ward was to develop a sharply anti-psychologistic, anti-idealistic, and radically realistic critique of Kant's theory of judgment. Correspondingly, he also developed a sharply anti-psychologistic and radically realistic (and in particular, moral-intuitionist) extension of Kant's ethics, although in this respect Moore quite explicitly *followed* Brentano's *Origin of Our Knowledge of Right and Wrong*.[39] In any case, Moore's critique of Kant's theory of judgment was later published in his remarkable papers "The nature of judgment" (1899) and "The refutation of idealism" (1903). And in the same year as "Refutation," Moore also published his radical extension of Kant's ethics in *Principia Ethica* (for some details, see the section below, "Kant, Moore again, and the naturalistic fallacy").

Moore's ostensible target in "The nature of judgment" is the neo-Hegelian F. H. Bradley (1846–1924), specifically his theory of judgment in his *Principles of Logic* (1883). But the real target is Kant.[40] Moore's basic objection is that Bradley's (read: Kant's) theory of judgment involves a psychologistic confusion between two senses of the "content" of a cognition: (1) content as that which literally belongs to the phenomenally conscious mental act of cognizing (the psychologically immanent content, or intentional act-content); and (2) content as that at which the mental act is directed, or "about" (the psychologically transcendent content, or objective intentional content). The communicable meaning and truth-or-falsity of the judgment belong strictly to objective intentional content. According to Moore, the Bradley–Kant theory of judgment assimilates the objective intentional content of judgment – that is, the proposition – to the act-content of judging. This is what, in the Preface to *Principia Ethica*, Moore glosses as

> the fundamental contradiction of modern Epistemology – the contradiction involved in both distinguishing and identifying the *object* and the *act* of Thought, 'truth' itself and its supposed *criterion*.[41]

Given this "contradiction," the communicable meaning and the truth-or-falsity of cognition are both reduced to the point of view of a single phenomenally conscious subject. The unpalatable consequences are that meaning becomes unshareably private (semantic solipsism) and that truth turns into mere personal belief (cognitive relativism).

For Moore himself by contrast, judgments are essentially truth-bearing or falsity-bearing connections of mind-independent Platonic universals called "concepts." So concepts are decidedly not, as they were for Kant, simple or complex unities of mental content under the analytic and synthetic unities of self-consciousness. Nor do Moorean concepts and judgments relate to objects in the world, as concepts and judgments alike had for Kant, via directly referential, singular, existential, non-conceptual sensory mental representations, or intuitions (*Anschauungen*). On the contrary and in explicit rejection of Kant's theory of judgment, for Moore complex concepts and judgments alike are mind-independent logically unified semantic complexes built up out of simple concepts grasped by direct Platonic insight. But not only that: according to Moore the world itself is nothing but a nexus of simple or complex concepts insofar as they enter into true propositions.[42] No wonder then that, as his fellow Cambridge Apostle and philosophical sparring partner the logician and economist John Maynard Keynes (1883–1946) later wrily reported, Moore once had a nightmare in which he could not distinguish propositions from tables.[43]

Moore's "Refutation of idealism" and his corresponding Aristotelian Society paper "Kant's idealism" (1904) are even more explicitly anti-Kantian. Here Moore ingeniously doubly assimilates Kant's transcendental idealism to Brentano and to Berkeley by interpreting Kantian appearances as sensory intentional objects that "in-exist" or are nothing but immanent contents of phenomenal consciousness. This of course completely overlooks Kant's crucial distinction between inner sense and outer sense,

not to mention his equally crucial doctrine of empirical realism, and his Refutation of Idealism (*CPR* B274–9). And it also incidentally ushered in another hundred years of phenomenalistic interpretations of Kant's theory of appearances.[44]

By vivid contrast to Kant's supposed phenomenalism however, Moore's radical realism is the thesis that every object exists as the external relatum of the intentionality of a sheer transparent subjective consciousness. But this implies, in an odd reversal of Brentano's doctrine of mental phenomena – whereby intentional objects reduce to "immanent objectivities" – that all intentional contents are now external intentional objects, and that therefore there will be as many mind-independently real objects as there are fine-grained differences between intentional contents. So Moore uses the transparency of consciousness to escape Brentano's conception of narrowly ideal phenomenal content enclosed within the mental intention, only to lose himself in a Platonic looking-glass world of unrestrictedly many real intentional objects, one for every possible act of thought – presumably even including the impossible ones that the White Queen boasted of having before breakfast.[45] Brentano's student, the radical phenomenological ontologist Alexius Meinong (1853–1928), had gone through precisely the same looking-glass.[46] Russell's great task as an analytic philosopher was to bring them all back alive.

Kant, Russell, and logicism

Russell, like Moore, began his philosophical career as a psychologistic neo-Kantian, in an early treatise on the nature of geometry, *An Essay on the Foundations of Geometry* (1897), which was also based on *his* Trinity fellowship dissertation. The basic point of the *Essay* was to determine what could be preserved of Kant's Euclid-oriented theories of space and geometry after the discovery and development of non-Euclidean geometries. Russell had been supervised by Ward too, and by Whitehead. At the same time there was also a significant Hegelian element in Russell's early thought, inspired by his close study of Bradley's *Logic* and discussions with another Trinity man and fellow Apostle, the imposingly-named Scottish Hegelian metaphysician John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart (1866-1925).[47] Despite being a close friend of Russell's, Moore wrote a sternly critical review of the *Essay* which was comparable in its both its philosophical content and its impact on Russell to Frege's review of Husserl's *Philosophy of Arithmetic*, in that it accused Russell of committing the "Kantian fallacy" of grounding a priori modal claims on psychological facts.[48] Moore's stinging criticism seems to have almost instantly liberated Russell from his neo-Kantian and Hegelian beliefs. This, combined with the close study of Meinong's writings, led him to a radically realistic Moorean see-through epistemology and a correspondingly rich looking-glass ontology of concrete and abstract real individuals, although he prudently stopped well short of accepting the existence or subsistence of Meinongian impossibilia.[49]

In any case, powered up by strong shots of Moore and Meinong, Russell's titanically brilliant, restless, and obsessive intellect[50] was now focused exclusively on the logical foundations of mathematics, and deeply engaged with the works of George Boole (1815–64), Frege, and the Italian logician Giuseppe Peano (1858–1932). By

1903 Russell had produced the massive *Principles of Mathematics*, and then by 1910, in collaboration with Whitehead, the even more massive *Principia Mathematica*. Above all however, on the collective basis of his intellectual encounters with Kant, Bradley, Boole, Frege, Peano, Whitehead, Moore, and Meinong, he developed a fundamental conception of *pure or symbolic logic*.

Pure or symbolic logic as Russell understood it, is the non-psychological, universal, necessary, and a priori science of deductive consequence, expressed in a bivalent propositional and polyadic predicate calculus with identity as well as quantification over an infinity of individuals, properties, and various kinds of functions. Pure or symbolic logic in this heavy-duty sense has direct metaphysical implications. But most importantly for our purposes here, Russell's logic expresses the direct avoidance of Kant's appeal to intuition in the constitution of mathematical propositions and reasoning:

> [T]he Kantian view … asserted that mathematical reasoning is not strictly formal, but always uses intuitions, *i.e.* the *à priori* knowledge of space and time. Thanks to the progress of Symbolic Logic, especially as treated by Professor Peano, this part of the Kantian philosophy is now capable of a final and irrevocable refutation.[51]

The result of all these influences, together with Russell's maniacally creative intellectual drive in the period from 1900 to 1913, was a seminal conception of philosophical analysis based on a radically platonistic, atomistic, and logicistic realism, according to which (1) not merely arithmetic but all of mathematics including geometry reduces to pure or symbolic logic, (2) propositions literally contain the simple concrete particulars (instantaneous sense-data) and simple abstract universals (properties or relations) that populate the mind-independently real world,[52] and (3) both the simple concrete particulars and abstract universals are known directly and individually by cognitive acts of self-evident and infallible acquaintance.[53] In autobiographical retrospect, Russell explicitly identified his conception of analysis with his complete rejection of Kant's metaphysics:

> Ever since I abandoned the philosophy of Kant … I have sought solutions of philosophical problems by means of analysis; and I remain firmly persuaded … that only by analysing is progress possible.[54]

But that tells only *part* of the story about Russellian analysis. In fact Russell's program of philosophical analysis had fundamentally collapsed by 1914, mainly as the result of his tumultuous personal and philosophical encounters with the young Wittgenstein:

> [Wittgenstein] had a kind of purity which I have never known equalled except by G. E. Moore. … He used to come to see me every evening at midnight, and pace up and down my room like a wild beast for three hours in agitated silence. Once I said to him: "Are you thinking about logic or about your sins?"

"Both," he replied, and continued his pacing. I did not like to suggest that it was time for bed, as it seemed probable both to him and me that on leaving me he would commit suicide.[55]

From 1912 onwards Wittgenstein was ostensibly Russell's research student, working with him on the philosophy of logic and the logical foundations of mathematics, and supposedly becoming Russell's philosophical successor. But the student, who was as personally difficult as he was philosophically brilliant, soon very helpfully pointed out to his teacher the irreversible philosophical errors in his work-in-progress, *Theory of Knowledge*.[56] This criticism changed Russell's philosophical life, and he abandoned *Theory of Knowledge* shortly thereafter:

> I wrote a lot of stuff about Theory of Knowledge, which Wittgenstein criticised with the greatest severity[.] His criticism … was an event of first-rate importance in my life, and affected everything I have done since. I saw he was right, and I saw that I could not hope ever again to do fundamental work in philosophy. My impulse was shattered, like a wave dashed to pieces against a breakwater. … I *had* to produce lectures for America, but I took a metaphysical subject although I was and am convinced that all fundamental work in philosophy is logical. My reason was that Wittgenstein persuaded me that what wanted doing in logic was too difficult for me. So there was really no vital satisfaction of my philosophical impulse in that work, and philosophy lost its hold on me. That was due to Wittgenstein more than to the war.[57]

Despite being shattered to pieces against a breakwater, nevertheless in typical Russellian fashion he promptly sat down and wrote *Our Knowledge of the External World* (1914) for his Lowell Lectures at Harvard. And leaving aside Russell's characteristic self-dramatization, the simple facts of the matter are (1) that Wittgenstein had seriously challenged four fundamental elements of Russell's seminal conception of analysis, and (2) that he had no effective reply to Wittgenstein's challenges.

Recall that Russell's notion of analysis in the period from 1900 to 1913 is logicistic, platonistic, radically realistic, and grounded epistemically on a series of self-evident infallible acquaintances with the simple concrete or abstract constituents of propositions. One problem with this notion is that Russell never provides an adequate explanation of how a human mind in real time and space can be directly related to causally inert non-spatio-temporal universals (the problem of *non-empirical knowledge*). Another problem is how propositions construed as ordered complexes of individuals, properties, and relations, along with logical connectives or constants such as *all*, *some*, *and*, *or*, *not*, and *if–then*, can ever be formally or materially unified into coherent, semantically unambiguous truth-bearers (the problem of *the unity of the proposition*). A third problem is that the notion of a direct self-evident infallible acquaintance with logical constants, as if they were regular objects alongside real individuals, properties, and relations, seems absurd (the problem of *the nature of the logical constant*). And a fourth and final problem is that Russell never adequately clarifies the nature or status

of logical necessity, and in particular whether logical truths are analytic a priori, synthetic a priori, or something else (the problem of *the nature of necessity*). To be sure, all four problems had already been handled by Kant by means of his transcendental idealism: non-empirical knowledge is based on transcendental reflection or self-knowledge; the unity of the proposition is based on the transcendental unity of apperception; logical constants are nothing universal functions of thought, corresponding to pure concepts of the understanding; and logical necessity is irreducibly analytic necessity, not synthetic necessity. But it was precisely the Kantian approach that Russell was completely rejecting. So these possible solutions to his problems were already ruled out, and he was thereby driven into a theoretical cul de sac.

Russell and Wittgenstein were personally divided by World War I. Russell very bravely professed pacifism in a nation hell-bent on smashing the Germans, and was imprisoned by the British government and lost his Trinity fellowship – a bellicose and by now philosophically alienated McTaggart working hard to bring this about – for his troubles. Wittgenstein went back to Austria and very bravely fought on the German side, and was imprisoned by the Allies in Italy after the German surrender for *his* troubles. Back in England however, by the end of the Great War Russell had completely capitulated to Wittgenstein's conception of philosophical analysis. He officially recorded this conversion in his long essay, "The philosophy of logical atomism":

> The following is the text of a course of eight lectures delivered in Gordon Square London, in the first months of 1918, which are very largely concerned with explaining certain ideas which I learned from my friend and former pupil, Ludwig Wittgenstein. I have had no opportunity of knowing his views since August, 1914, and I do not even know whether he is alive or dead.[58]

Kant, Wittgenstein, and the Tractatus

The "certain ideas" that Russell spoke of were elaborately worked out by Wittgenstein in a stunningly unorthodox masterpiece written from 1913 to 1918 and published in 1921, the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. This "logico-philosophical treatise" (*Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung*) offers a radically new conception of philosophical analysis, according to which

1 not only mathematics but also metaphysics reduces to the propositions of logic (including both the truth-functional tautologies and the logico-philosophical truths of the *Tractatus* itself) together with factual propositions;
2 factual propositions and facts alike reduce to logically-structured complexes of ontologically neutral "objects," which can variously play the structural roles of both particulars and universals (including both properties and relations);
3 factual propositions are nothing but linguistic facts that "picture" other facts according to one-to-one isomorphic correspondence relations;
4 all non-factual propositions are either (a) "senseless" (*sinnlos*) truth-functional tautologies expressing nothing but the formal meanings and deductive implications

of the logical constants, (b) the logico-philosophical propositions of the *Tractatus* itself, or (c) "nonsensical" (*unsinnig*) pseudo-propositions that violate logico-syntactic rules and logico-semantic categories, especially including all the synthetic a priori claims of traditional metaphysics;

5 the logical constants do not represent facts or refer to objects of any sort (prop. 4.0312) but instead merely "display" (*darstellen*) the a priori logical "scaffolding of the world" (prop. 6.124), which is also "the limits of my language" (prop. 5.6), and can only be "shown" or non-propositionally indicated, *not* "said" or propositionally described;

6 the logical form of the world is therefore "transcendental" (prop. 6.13), and finally

7 the logical form of the world reduces to the language-using metaphysical subject or ego, who is not in any way part of the world but in fact solipsistically identical to the world itself.

Looking at theses (5), (6), and (7), we can clearly see that Wittgenstein's new "transcendental" conception of analysis is radically ontologically ascetic, since everything logically reduces to one simple thing: the language-using metaphysical subject or ego. Indeed, it is by means of theses (5) and (6) that Wittgenstein directly expresses the surprising and often-overlooked but quite indisputable fact that the *Tractatus* is every bit as much a neo-Kantian idealistic metaphysical treatise directly inspired by Arthur Schopenhauer's *World as Will and Representation* (1819, 1844, 1859),[59] and thereby mediately inspired by Kant's first *Critique*, as it is a logico-philosophical treatise inspired by Frege's *Begriffsschrift* and Russell's and Whitehead's *Principia*. Whereas Russell *abandoned* Kant's epistemology and metaphysics, Wittgenstein *sublimated* them. And from this standpoint, we can see that the *Tractatus* is fundamentally an essay in *transcendental logic*:

> The limit of language is shown by its being impossible to describe the fact which corresponds to (is the translation of) a sentence, without simply repeating the sentence. (This has to do with the Kantian solution of the problem of philosophy.)[60]

The *Tractatus* ends with the strangely moving proposition, "Wovon man nicht sprechen kann, darüber muss mann schweigen": "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent" (prop. 7). What on earth does this mean? One possible interpretation, now known as the "resolute" reading, is that proposition 7 is saying that the *Tractatus* itself – except for the Preface and proposition 7 – is literally nonsense.[61] But against a Schopenhauerian and Kantian backdrop, this extreme and implausible reading can be neatly avoided, because proposition 7 is then instead saying:

1 that traditional metaphysics has been destroyed by the philosophical logic of the *Tractatus* just as Kant's first *Critique* had destroyed traditional metaphysics;

2 that the logico-philosophical propositions of the *Tractatus* itself *would have* counted as literally nonsensical because they are neither factual propositions nor truth-functional logical truths, *were it not for* the much deeper fact

3 that these Tractarian propositions are *self-manifesting transcendental truths in the Kantian sense* about the nature of logic, and thus have the basic function of constituting a logical stairway or "ladder" (*Leiter*) between the factual natural sciences and ethics, and finally

4 that ethics consists exclusively in mystical feeling and noncognitive volitions (props. 6.4–6.522), not propositional thoughts.

So at the end of the *Tractatus* Wittgenstein logically transcends scientific knowledge in order to reach the ethical standpoint. And this is precisely why in 1919 – perhaps not entirely coincidentally, shortly after he had studied the *Critique of Pure Reason* carefully for the first time[62] – he told the journal editor Ludwig von Ficker that "the [*Tractatus*]'s point is an ethical one."[63] As we have already seen, Kant makes essentially the same radical move in the B edition Preface to the first *Critique*: "I had to deny *scientific knowing* (*Wissen*) in order to make room for [moral] *faith* (*Glauben*)" (*CPR* Bxxx).

Kant, Carnap, and logical positivism

Wittgenstein's actions conformed to his written words, and he gave up philosophy for roughly ten years after the publication of the *Tractatus*. During Wittgenstein's "silent decade" – equally but oppositely, Kant's own silent decade had immediately *preceded* the publication of the first *Critique*[64] – Rudolf Carnap (1891–1970) was discovering his own voice. Falling into what will by now no doubt seem like a familiar pattern, and indeed very like Russell, Carnap started his philosophical career as a neo-Kantian philosopher of the foundations of geometry:

> I studied Kant's philosophy with Bruno Baum in Jena. In his seminar, the *Critique of Pure Reason* was discussed in detail for an entire year. I was strongly impressed by Kant's conception that the geometrical structure of space is determined by our forms of intuition. The after-effects of this influence were still noticeable in the chapter on the space of intuition in my dissertation, *Der Raum* [published in 1922]. … Knowledge of intuitive space I regarded at the time, under the influence of Kant and the neo-Kantians, especially Natorp and Cassirer, as based on "pure intuition," and independent of contingent experience.[65]

Carnap's progress away from Kant's metaphysics also followed the familiar dual pattern of (1) treating post-Kantian developments in the exact sciences as refutations of basic Kantian theses, and (2) replacing transcendental idealism with philosophical logic. By the end of the 1920s and into the early parts of the 1930s, Carnap had been heavily influenced by the Theory of Relativity and by the close study of Frege's writings, along

with the Russell's and Whitehead's *Principia*, Russell's *Our Knowledge of the External World*, and above all the *Tractatus*. Carnap's intellectual ferment was expressed in two important books, *The Logical Structure of the World* (*Logische Aufbau der Welt*, 1928), and *The Logical Syntax of Language* (1934).

The *Aufbau* played a crucial variation on Russell's platonistic conception of philosophical analysis by turning it into *constructive empiricism*, which can be glossed as follows:

> The natural world as a whole is the object of analysis. But the simples out of which the world is logically constructed are not Really Real mind-independent substances but instead nothing but subjective streams of experience and a single fundamental relation, *the recollection of similarity*.

Correspondingly, *Logical Syntax* converts Wittgenstein's transcendental conception of analysis into *logico-linguistic conventionalism*, which can be glossed this way:

> There is no One True Logic, just as there is no One True Natural Language, but instead there as many distinct logical languages as there are formal symbolic calculi constructed on the models of the *Begriffsschift* and *Principia*, plus distinct axiom-systems, or distinct sets of logical constants, or distinct notions of logical consequence; and the choice of precisely which logical language is to be adopted as the basis of the exact sciences is purely a pragmatic matter (whether voluntaristic or social) having nothing to do with logic itself.

The overall result is that Kant's "transcendental turn" from the apparent world to a set of a priori world-structures that are imposed on phenomenal appearances by our innate spontaneous cognitive capacities, is replaced by Carnap with a "linguistic turn"[66] from the apparent world to a set of a priori world-structures that are imposed on those phenomenal appearances by the syntax and semantics of our logical and natural languages. Needless to say however, even *after* the linguistic turn, the gambit of imposing a priori logico-linguistic structures on phenomenal appearances remains basically a neo-Kantian and thereby Kantian move.[67] Indeed, the very same Carnapian fusion of pure logic and epistemological neo-Kantianism is vividly evident in C. I. Lewis's *Mind and the World Order* (1929) and Nelson Goodman's *The Structure of Appearance* (1951).

In any case, Carnap's *Aufbau* and *Logical Syntax*, together with the basic writings of Frege, Russell, and Wittgenstein, and also Moritz Schlick's *General Theory of Knowledge* (1925), became the philosophical basis of the Vienna Circle,[68] which flourished throughout most of the 1930s, until the coming-to-power of the Nazis in Germany caused the diaspora of its core membership to England and the USA. The political leanings of the inner circle of the Circle were radical socialist, universalist, egalitarian, and Communist. So staying in Austro-Germany would have most certainly meant their cultural and intellectual deaths, and very probably their actual deaths too.

The Circle philosophically professed logical positivism or logical empiricism, which is essentially the fusion of Carnap's constructive empiricism and logical conventionalism, plus the explicit rejection of Kant's notion of the synthetic a priori. According to Carnap, synthetic a priori propositions are meaningless because they violate rules of the logical syntax of language.[69] And according to Moritz Schlick (1882–1936), the official founder and leader of the Circle, synthetic a priori propositions are meaningless because they are neither tautological logical truths (analytic truths) nor verifiable factual empirical truths, and analyticity and verifiability exhaust the possible sources of cognitive significance.[70] The Carnap–Schlick attack on the synthetic a priori, plus constructive empiricism, plus logico-linguistic conventionalism, plus the general semantic thesis that all and only meaningful propositions are either analytic logical truths or else verifiable empirical factual propositions (the Verifiability Principle or VP), were all crisply formulated and beautifully written up for English-speaking philosophers in A. J. Ayer's *Language, Truth, and Logic* (1936).

It is however a notorious and serious problem for Alfred Jules Ayer (1910–89) in particular, and for the Vienna Circle more generally, that the VP itself is neither an analytic proposition nor a factual proposition. Looked at with a wide lens, the problem of the logico-semantic status of the VP is merely a special case of Wittgenstein's earlier worry about the logico-semantic status of his Tractarian logico-philosophical propositions. A standard "solution" to the special worry is to say that the VP is a *meta-linguistic* or *meta-logical* proposition: the VP is nothing but a further bit of language and logic that also happens to be about language and logic. But unfortunately that in turn only invokes an even more general and intractable worry about the logico-semantic status of meta-languages and meta-logics: *the logocentric predicament*, which says that *logic is epistemically circular,* in the sense that any attempt to explain or justify logic must itself presuppose and use some or all of the very logical principles and concepts that it aims to explain or justify.[71] The obvious way out of these problems would be to return to Kantian modal dualism and say that the VP is non-logically necessary or synthetic a priori. But of course this violates the official positivist ban on the synthetic a priori.

A parting of the ways? Kant, the Davos conference, and the Great Divide

In Davos, Switzerland, from 17 March to 6 April 1929, an "International University Course," sponsored by the Swiss, French, and German governments, brought together the leading neo-Kantian Ernst Cassirer, famous author of the multi-volume *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (1925, 1927, 1929),[72] and the soon-to-be leading phenomenologist Martin Heidegger, famous author of *Being and Time* (1927), in an official and more or less explicit attempt to bring about a philosophical reconciliation between Marburg (or science-oriented) neo-Kantianism and phenomenology.[73] The soon-to-be leading logical positivist Rudolf Carnap was there too, along with many other professors and students from across Europe. And a good time was had by all: "It appears that the Davos encounter itself took place in atmosphere of extraordinarily friendly collegiality."[74]

The key sessions at Davos were two lecture series by Cassirer and Heidegger, followed by a public disputation between them. Strikingly, both the lectures and the

disputation dealt with the question of how to interpret the *Critique of Pure Reason* correctly.[75] In other words, it was all about Kant and the neo-Kantian origins of phenomenology.

Now for this reason it can be argued, and indeed has been argued, that the Davos conference was emblematic of the death-by-mitosis of the neo-Kantian tradition, during the 1930s, into two fundamentally distinct and irreconcilable philosophical traditions: the analytic tradition (whose paradigm case was logical positivism), and the phenomenological tradition (whose paradigm case was existential phenomenology).[76] According to this historical reconstruction, the basic disagreements between analysis and phenomenology were latent in the period 1900–30, during which – as we have seen above – Moore, Russell, and Carnap all started their philosophical careers as neo-Kantians, went on to reject neo-Kantianism and Kant by means of foundational work in philosophical logic and the influence of the contemporary exact sciences, and then correspondingly worked out various new logically-driven conceptions of a priori analysis. And then, so the story goes, the latent eventually became manifest, and the post-Kantian stream of philosophical influence consisting of Brentano → Husserl/ Meinong → Heidegger was officially divided from the other post-Kantian stream consisting of Moore → Russell → Wittgenstein → Carnap, basically because the phenomenologists rejected the Frege–Russell conception of pure logic while contrariwise the analysts affirmed pure logic.[77] And never the twain shall meet.

But although this makes a conveniently neat story, it is at least arguably not quite true to the historico-philosophical facts. The highly collegial atmosphere at Davos was no polite put-on. Obviously there were some important differences and disagreements between logical positivism and existential phenomenology. Nevertheless Heidegger took Carnap very seriously as a philosopher well into the 1930s, and Carnap also took Heidegger very seriously as a philosopher well into the 1930s.[78] (As did Wittgstenstein,[79] and as also did Gilbert Ryle at Oxford[80] – who, according to Michael Dummett, "began his career as an exponent of Husserl for British audiences and used to lecture on Bolzano, Brentano, Frege, Meinong, and Husserl"[81] throughout the 1920s and 1930s.) For his part, Heidegger was every bit as dismissive of traditional metaphysics as Carnap was.[82] And while it is quite true that Heidegger significantly criticized the Fregean and Russellian pure logic of the *Begriffsschrift* and *Principia Mathematica,* and challenged its metaphysical commitments, so too did Carnap; after all, that is the main point of the *Logical Syntax of Language.* Furthermore, objectively considered, Heidegger's existential phenomenology is not essentially *more* different from or opposed to pure logic, or logical positivism for that matter, than is Dewey's pragmatism, which despite its radical critical philosophical implications (see "American philosophy in the twentieth century," Chapter 5),[83] cohabited very comfortably with mainstream analytic philosophy in the USA after 1945. Nor, objectively speaking, is Heidegger's existential phenomenology essentially *more* different from or opposed to either pure logic, or logical positivism, than is Wittgenstein's later philosophy as expressed in his *Philosophical Investigations* (1953), which despite its equally radical critical philosophical implications,[84] also cohabited very comfortably with mainstream analytic philosophy in the USA and England after 1945.

So it appears that the Great Divide between analytic philosophy and phenomenology did not actually happen in the 1930s. And it also appears that the Divide is not the consequence of any fundamental philosophical disagreements between analysts and phenomenologists about pure logic. On the contrary, it *appears* that the Divide happened almost entirely after 1945, and that it was the joint result of the three following factors:

1   The sharply divisive cultural politics of anti-fascism and anti-Communism in Anglo-American countries after World War II: Heidegger publicly and notoriously supported the Nazis in the mid-thirties;[85] Vienna Circle exiles in the USA were understandably very eager to avoid being persecuted during the McCarthy Communist-trials era for their pre-war radical-socialist and Communist sympathies, so were generally playing it safe (Carnap however being a notable exception[86]) by not rocking the boat;[87] and the leading French phenomenologists Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice Merleau-Ponty were both closely politically associated with the radical Left.[88]
2   The sharply divisive debate about the cultural-political significance and philosophical implications of the exact sciences after World War II; taking his cue from Heidegger's *Being and Time*, but also reflecting on the worsening cultural-political situation in Europe, Husserl had seriously criticized the epistemological and metaphysical foundations of the exact sciences in his *Crisis of European Sciences*; and then taking his cue directly from Husserl, Merleau-Ponty further deepened and developed this critique in his *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945).
3   The sharply divisive struggle for control of the major Anglo-American philosophy departments after World War II: given the aging and retirement of historically-trained philosophers, neo-Kantians, and neo-Hegelians, it was going to be either the analysts or the phenomenologists who took over, but not both.[89]

In other words, I am suggesting that although the Great Divide between analytic philosophy and phenomenology is real enough, *nevertheless it didn't happen until after 1945*, and *was essentially the result of cultural-political factors, together with one serious philosophical disagreement about the foundations of the exact sciences*. To be sure, this is only one possible explanation of the historical facts. But in any case the serious philosophical disagreement was itself definitely of Kantian origin, for as we saw at the end of the section "Kant's metaphysics," Kant explicitly rejects scientific or reductive naturalism.

Kantian themes in the middle and later analytic tradition

Kant, Quine, and the analytic/synthetic distinction

Although the official or institutional acceptance of the basic tenets of logical positivism by the leading Anglo-American philosophy departments did not fully occur until the end of the 1950s, by 1945 all that actually remained of Kant's metaphysical legacy for

philosophers in the analytic tradition were (1) the analytic/synthetic distinction, and (2) the notion of the a priori, including the idea that apriority and necessity entail each other. It is to be particularly noted, however, that both doctrines are intrinsic parts of the original foundations of analytic philosophy.

Yet these doctrines were repeatedly attacked from 1950 onwards until the end of the century by Carnap's protégé and greatest critic, W. V. O. Quine (1908–2000). In fact, Quine's "Two dogmas of empiricism" (1951) effectively destroyed logical empiricism or positivism and the philosophical basis of the analytic tradition along with it. So the analytic tradition quietly committed cognitive suicide by undermining its own Kantian foundations. Reflecting on this striking fact, it will perhaps seem to be a very puzzling thing that the *institution* of analytic philosophy has been able to get along so well since 1950 without any philosophical foundations. A possible solution to this puzzle will be proposed in the section "The end of the a priori: Kant, Sellars, and scientific naturalism," below.

The two dogmas of logical empiricism attacked by Quine are (1) the thesis that there is a sharp and significant distinction between analytic and synthetic truths, and (2) the thesis of "reductionism," which says that every empirically meaningful proposition has a unique translation into a determinate set of logically independent atomic propositions in a sense-datum language. Now any proposition that expresses the unique translation of an empirically meaningful proposition into a determinate set of logically independent propositions in a sense-datum language is itself going to be an analytic proposition. So if (1) goes down, then (2) also goes down. Therefore the crucial dogma is the analytic/synthetic distinction.

Quine's argument against the analytic/synthetic distinction in "Two dogmas"[90] is famously crisp, and proceeds like the basic steps of a dance. He starts by defining analyticity as the truth of a statement by virtue of meanings alone, independently of fact. Then he discards *intensional* meanings – that is, meanings that (1) are essentially descriptive in character, (2) are underdetermined by reference, (3) uniquely determine cross-possible-worlds extensions of terms, and (4) directly entail the modal concepts of necessity and possibility – on the grounds that intensions are nothing but "obscure intermediary entities" unhelpfully inserted between words and their Fregean reference or *Bedeutung*. Then he distinguishes between two types of analytic truth: (1) the truths of classical bivalent first-order predicate logic with identity, and (2) analytic statements that are not truths of class (1), but that can be systematically translated into truths of class (1) by systematically replacing synonyms with synonyms. Then he accepts the analytic truths of class (1) as provisionally unproblematic, and focuses on the analytic truths of class (2). Then he considers, case by case, three attempts to give a clear and determinate account of synonymy: definition, interchangeability, and semantic rules. Then he shows that each attempt ends in circularity by employing various notions that presuppose or entail the unreduced concept of intensional identity, and rejects them all. And then finally he concludes that without the provision of a non-circular account of synonymy,

> a boundary between analytic and synthetic statements simply has not been found. That there is such a distinction to be drawn at all is an unempirical dogma, a metaphysical article of faith.[91]

This argument changed the face of twentieth-century philosophy. Yet it is a *very* bad argument. The many problems with it can be sorted into two sorts: (1), those having to do with whether his argument actually applies to *Kant's* analytic/synthetic distinction, and (2) those having to do with the soundness of his argument against the logical positivists' analytic/synthetic distinction.

(1) Quine's argument clearly does not apply to Kant's analytic/synthetic distinction, for two reasons. First, Quine says that a statement is analytic if and only if it is true by virtue of meanings independently of fact. But for Kant, this gloss would also hold of synthetic a priori propositions, because (a) "meanings" for him include both concepts and *intuitions*, (b) synthetic apriority is defined in terms of a proposition's semantic dependence on pure intuitions, and (c) Quine presupposes without argument that there are no such things as synthetic a priori propositions.[92] Kant would therefore reject the "if" part of Quine's definition of analyticity. Second, according to Kant, a proposition is analytic if and only if it is necessarily true by virtue of intrinsic structural semantic relations between conceptual intensions.[93] Since Quine will not countenance intrinsically structured intensions as meanings, this implies that Kant would also reject the "only if" part of Quine's definition of analyticity. Indeed, since Quine rejects all semantic appeals to intensions from the outset, his attack on analyticity simply cannot apply to Kant's theory.

(2) Furthermore Quine's argument is clearly unsound, for four reasons. First, since he explicitly *accepts* analytic propositions of class (1), it is false to say that no sharp boundary can be found between analytic and synthetic statements. For there *is* by Quine's own reckoning a sharp boundary between analytic truths of class (1) and all other truths. Second, as J. J. Katz points out, even if we focus exclusively on analytic truths of class (2), those based on synonymy, the argument against the intelligibility of such truths is based entirely on an argument by cases, and Quine never gives an argument to show that his set of cases is exhaustive.[94] Third, as H. P. Grice (1913–88) and P. F. Strawson (1919–2006) argue, even if we grant that Quine has shown that *every possible* attempt to define analyticity in terms of synonymy for cases of class (2) ends in circularity with respect to the notion of intensional identity, he still has not shown that an explanation of analyticity in terms of a circular network of irreducibly intensional notions is a philosophically *bad* thing: philosophical analysis can be a semantically *non-reductive* and *holistic* enterprise.[95] Fourth and perhaps most damningly of all, Quine's arguments for the rejection of intensions are both insufficient and self-stultifying, because he himself covertly presupposes intensions in order to explain the analytic truths of class (1).[96]

So Quine's attack on the analytic/synthetic distinction does not actually apply to Kant, and is based on an unsound argument to boot. Still, the attack almost universally convinced analytic philosophers. For example, in a 40-year survey article on the philosophy of language and mind published in the *Philosophical Review* in 1992, Tyler Burge (1946–) asserted:

> no clear reasonable support has been devised for a distinction between truths
> that depend for their truth on meaning alone and truths that depend for their

truth on their meaning together with (perhaps necessary) features of their subject-matter.[97]

This seems astounding when it is recalled that to reject the analytic/synthetic distinction is to undermine the foundations of philosophical analysis itself.[98] Fortunately there was at least one prominent analytic philosopher after 1945 who was willing to challenge Quine's apostasy: Peter Frederick Strawson.

Kant, Strawson, and transcendental arguments

At this point there is an important twist in the plot of our historical narrative: Strawson, the primary *defender* of philosophical analysis after Quine, was also a *Kantian* philosopher. But as we will see, Strawson's highly influential version of Kantian philosophy nevertheless leaves twenty-first century Kantians with a fundamental leftover problem to solve.

Strawson initially worked in philosophical logic, was strongly influenced by the *Critique of Pure Reason*, and also wrote an important treatise in transcendental metaphysics. Trained at Oxford before World War II by neo-Kantians and British Hegelians, and – along with his Oxford contemporaries J. L. Austin, A. J. Ayer, Michael Dummett, Paul Grice, and Gilbert Ryle – heavily influenced by the logico-linguistic tradition stemming from Frege, Russell, and Wittgenstein, Strawson was arguably the most important British philosopher from 1945 to the end of the century.

We have already seen that along with Grice, Strawson defended the analytic/synthetic distinction against Quine by developing a non-reductive and holistic conception of philosophical analysis.[99] This in turn is intimately connected with Strawson's vigorous defense of irreducible conceptual intensionality in both logic and semantics, in *Introduction to Logical Theory* (1952), *Logico-Linguistic Papers* (1971), and *Subject and Predicate in Logic and Grammar* (1974). Here it is obvious that Strawson's line of thinking runs strongly parallel to Kant's theory of judgment, analyticity, and logic, which is also explicitly based on irreducible conceptual intensionality.[100]

Irreducible conceptual intensionality is also a basic theme of Strawson's immensely influential book on Kant, *The Bounds of Sense* (1966). *Bounds* not only made it respectable for analytic philosophers to write books on topics in the history of philosophy; it also developed a highly original and still controversial interpretation of the first *Critique* that is at once semantically oriented (Strawson treats Kant as a verificationist), anti-psychologistic (he rejects Kant's transcendental psychology), and anti-idealistic (he accuses Kant of Berkeleyanism).

The crucial move in *Bounds*, however, is to connect Kant's seminal idea of a "transcendental deduction" or "transcendental proof" (*CPR* A84–92/B116–24, B274–9, A734–8/B762–66) directly with the logico-semantic concept of a *presupposition* that Strawson had developed in *Introduction to Logical Theory*. The result is the more-or-less Kantian notion of a *transcendental argument*. Now a presupposition can be contextually defined as follows: A proposition Q presupposes a proposition P if and only if the truth of P is a necessary condition of the truth of Q and also a necessary

condition of the falsity of Q. Thus P is a necessary condition of the meaningfulness and truth-valuedness of Q. So what then is a transcendental argument? In its general form it looks like this:

1 Assume either the truth or the falsity of the proposition Q, where Q is a contingent claim about the world of human experience.
2 Show that the proposition P is a (or the) presupposition of Q, where P is a claim that is necessarily true and priori if it is true at all.
3 Derive the truth, and thus also the necessity and apriority, of P. [101]

A transcendental argument is also an *anti-skeptical* argument when P states the logical denial of some skeptical thesis such as the Cartesian dream-skeptic's "Possibly nothing exists outside my own phenomenally conscious states" (which is what Kant calls the thesis of "problematic idealism" at *CPR* B274) and Q states a proposition that the skeptic herself also rationally accepts, such as "I am conscious of my existence as determined in time" (*CPR* B275).[102]

Strawson made explicit and liberal use of transcendental arguments in his ground-breaking book *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*.[103] So *Individuals* is a work firmly embedded in the Kantian tradition. Kant of course held that his transcendental deductions and proofs entailed transcendental psychology, idealism, and the synthetic apriority of P. And Strawson rejects idealism and modal dualism alike in favor of a thoroughly anti-psychologistic, non-reductive, holistic, analytical realism about individual universals, individual material objects, and individual persons.[104] But leaving all that aside, it remains only a very slight exaggeration to say that Strawson's "descriptive metaphysics" is Kant's transcendental metaphysics *minus* Kant's mentalism.

Nevertheless there is a serious worry about Strawson's key notion of a transcendental argument. It is arguable that step (2) will never work unless semantic verificationism is true, and further that verificationism is true only if transcendental idealism is true and P is synthetic a priori.[105] If this criticism is correct, then either verificationism and transcendental idealism are true and P is synthetic a priori, or else transcendental arguments are invalid. Alternatively, if this criticism is not correct, then it must be shown how step (2) can still work without verificationism, transcendental idealism, or the synthetic a priori. This is an unsolved problem that all Kantian philosophers after Strawson must face up to.

The end of the a priori: Kant, Sellars, and scientific naturalism

In *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy* (1951), the logical positivist and Vienna Circle insider Hans Reichenbach (1891–1953) sketched an influential and widely accepted history of the progress of modern philosophy that culminates with analytic philosophy and merges it ineluctably with the progress of the exact sciences. The basic idea is that philosophy is legitimate precisely to the extent that (1) it is analysis, and (2) it works on fundamental problems arising from mathematics and physics. This is

an important historical thesis, not only because it resuscitates Locke's seventeenth-century conception of philosophy as an "underlabourer" for the flagship sciences of the scientific revolution, but also, and indeed primarily because, its unabashed scientism was the engine that drove analytic philosophy in the second half of the twentieth century.

Now it is plausibly arguable, and has indeed been compellingly argued by, for example, Hilary Putnam (1926–) and John McDowell (1942–),[106] that the basic problem of European and Anglo-American analytic philosophy after 1950 – and perhaps also *the* fundamental problem of modern philosophy – is how it is possible to reconcile two sharply different, seemingly incommensurable, and apparently even mutually exclusive metaphysical conceptions, or "pictures," of the world. On the one hand, there is the objective, non-phenomenal, perspectiveless, mechanistic, value-neutral, impersonal, and amoral metaphysical picture of the world delivered by pure mathematics and the fundamental natural sciences. And on the other hand there is the subjective, phenomenal, perspectival, teleological, value-laden, person-oriented, and moral metaphysical picture of the world yielded by the conscious experience of rational human beings. In 1963 Wilfrid Sellars (1912–89) evocatively dubbed these two sharply opposed world-conceptions "the scientific image" and "the manifest image."[107] (For further discussion of Sellars see "American philosophy in the twentieth century," Chapter 5.) So I will call the profound difficulty raised by their mutual incommensurability and inconsistency the "two images problem."

From the 1950s onwards, a possible complete solution to the two images problem gradually emerged, in the form of scientific or reductive naturalism.[108] As we saw in the section "Kant's metaphysics," scientific or reductive naturalism asserts, in Sellars's crisp phrase, that "science is the measure of all things." More generally, scientific naturalism includes four basic theses:

1 *anti-supernaturalism*, or the rejection of any sort of explanatory appeal to non-physical, non-spatio-temporal entities or causal powers,
2 *scientism*, or the thesis that the exact sciences are the paradigms of reasoning and rationality, as regards both their methodology and their content,
3 *physicalist metaphysics*, or the thesis that all the facts are reducible to basic micro-physical facts, and
4 *radical empiricist epistemology*, or the thesis that all knowledge and truths are a posteriori.

Each of the theses of scientific naturalism is flagrantly anti-Kantian, in that it is the direct contradictory of some basic Kantian doctrine. Thus thesis (1) directly contradicts Kant's theory of transcendental freedom. Thesis (2) directly contradicts Kant's doctrine that logic and ethics are the paradigms of theoretical and practical reasoning. Thesis (3) directly contradicts Kant's transcendental idealism. And thesis (4) directly contradicts Kant's theory of the a priori.

There are two basic ways of holding the thesis that all knowledge and truths are a posteriori. One ways asserts the existence of *necessary a posteriori* truths and attempts

to substitute them for all necessary a priori truths, and this is the doctrine of *scientific essentialism*, which will be discussed shortly. The other way asserts that all truths are *contingent a posteriori*, and this is the doctrine of *modal skepticism*, as defended by Quine.[109] So, in other words, corresponding to scientific essentialism and Quine's modal skepticism there are two ways of contradicting Kant's theory of the a priori. The first way breaks the entailment from necessity to apriority. And the second way rejects the existence of necessity and apriority alike.

At this point there is another important historical twist in our narrative. This is the striking fact that Sellars was both the father of scientific naturalism[110] *and* a leading Kantian.[111] Wearing the latter hat, Sellars first formulated and defended the highly influential idea, later promoted by Donald Davidson (1917–2003)[112] and John McDowell,[113] that inner or outer sensory experience has no independent cognitive significance, semantic implications, or logical force apart from conceptualization and thought. Thus *percepts without concepts are rationally meaningless, or outside the logical space of reasons* (cf. *CPR* A51/B76), and to hold otherwise is to fall fallaciously under the siren spell of "the Myth of the Given."[114]

In McDowell's hands, this Sellarsian doctrine becomes the widely-held contemporary thesis of *conceptualism about mental content*, which says (1) that all cognitive capacities are fully determined by conceptual capacities, and (2) that none of the cognitive capacities of rational human animals can also be possessed by non-rational animals, whether human or non-human.[115] Now McDowell is not a scientific or reductive naturalist.[116] And McDowell's conceptualism is arguably more a *Hegelian* thesis than it is a Kantian thesis.[117] But looked at from *Sellars's* point of view, the deep connection between (a) conceptualism about mental content, (b) scientific naturalism, and (c) the two images problem, is this: *if* scientific naturalism is true, and *if* we also fully reject the Myth of the Given, *then* our best exact scientific theories will ultimately determine the structure, content, and objects of inner and outer sensory experience. And in that way, the scientific image both assimilates and also eliminates the manifest image.[118]

Oddly enough, although Sellars was the true father of scientific naturalism, Quine was the leading scientific naturalist in the latter half of the twentieth century even despite the presence of some important non-naturalistic strands in his work.[119] But the combined Sellars–Quine doctrine of scientific naturalism still would not, perhaps, have convinced most mainstream analytic philosophers of its truth without the additional support of the highly influential doctrine of *scientific essentialism* that was developed by Saul Kripke (1940–) and Hilary Putnam in the 1970s.[120] According to scientific essentialism,

1 natural kinds like gold and water have microphysical essences,
2 these essences are either known or are at least in principle knowable by contemporary natural science,
3 propositions stating these essences, such as "Water is H_2O," are necessarily true because statements of identity are necessarily true if true at all, and
4 essentialist necessary truths about natural kinds are knowable only a posteriori.

Unlike Quine, who was an anti-realist and a severe critic of modal logic, the scientific essentialists are both scientific realists and also strong proponents of the idea that modal logic is the analytic philosopher's fundamental analytical tool. So for essentialists, exact science and modal logic are *really deep*. If scientific essentialism is correct, then not all necessary truths are a priori, and perhaps even *all* necessary truths are a posteriori – and in that case, the very last substantive Kantian epistemological and metaphysical thesis in the analytic tradition, the existence of the a priori, again goes the way of all flesh.

We now have in place the means to offer a possible solution to the historico-philosophical puzzle described in the section "Kant, Quine, and the analytic/synthetic distinction," above. This puzzle was: How has analytic philosophy managed to get on so well institutionally since 1950 despite the fact that its Kantian foundations were undermined by Quine's attack on the analytic/synthetic distinction? And the possible solution I am proposing is: despite its foundational crisis, the analytic tradition has flourished since the middle of the twentieth century by affirming the Sellars–Quine doctrine of scientific naturalism, and by widely embracing scientific essentialism, and thus by latching itself for dear life onto the high speed train of the exact sciences.

Kantian themes in the middle and later phenomenological tradition

Kant, Husserl, and the crisis of European sciences

But is this high-speed train actually heading straight for a big smash-up? In 1947, Wittgenstein had precisely that thought:

> The truly apocalyptic view of the world is that things do not repeat themselves. It isn't absurd, e.g., to believe that the age of science and technology is the beginning of the end for humanity; the idea of great progress is a delusion, along with the idea that the truth will ultimately be known; that there is nothing good or desirable about scientific knowledge and that mankind, in seeking it, is falling into a trap. It is by no means obvious that this is not how things are.[121]

Husserl had also seriously considered the same sobering idea in the early 1930s, in conjunction with a close reading of his former student Heidegger's *Being and Time*. The result was a series of manuscripts composed between 1934 and 1938 and posthumously published as *The Crisis of European Sciences* (1954).

In the *Crisis*, Husserl attempts to combine his transcendental phenomenology with the profound existential-phenomenological thesis that the conscious, intentional, cognizing, and knowing rational human subject is necessarily embodied as a living animal, and also necessarily situated in and actively engaged with an integrated network of spatio-temporal, macrophysical, practical, intersubjective or social, and historical contexts. He called this total network the "lifeworld" (*Lebenswelt*). By sharp contrast, the classical conception of the rational human subject and its world which

is offered by the exact sciences, either (1) converts the rational human subject into an alienated, fundamentally non-physical, causally-isolated, or even epiphenomenal phenomenally conscious Cartesian ego over against a fundamentally physical world of causally efficacious microphysical entities and forces (= Cartesian substance dualism plus Boyle's and Locke's microphysicalism), or else (2) explanatorily and ontologically reduces the human subject to nothing but fundamentally physical properties and facts (= reductive materialism). In either case we are in serious philosophical trouble because, as Kant had explicitly pointed out in the first *Critique*, both human knowledge and freedom are thereby rendered respectively impossible by the Cartesian skepticism entailed by (1)[122] and the "hard" or incompatibilist determinism entailed by (2).[123] But as Husserl makes very clear, since the exact sciences *themselves* are rational human enterprises seemingly based on the presuppositions of human knowledge and freedom, this means that the sciences themselves are in serious trouble too: hence their foundational "crisis."

The only way out of the crisis, according to Husserl, is to invert the epistemic and metaphysical foundations, and show how exact science is in fact explanatorily and ontologically founded *on the lifeworld*, which is then in turn intentionally "constituted" by *the transcendental ego*. This if course is a classically Kantian move. But will Husserl's lifeworld-constituting "transcendental-phenomenological turn" be able to avoid falling back into Cartesian substance dualism?

The end of phenomenology: Kant, Derrida, and deconstructionism

According to the highly influential French philosopher Jacques Derrida (1930–2004), the answer was a resounding *no*. Derrida started his career as a Husserlian phenomenologist; his thesis at the École Normale Supérieure was a general study of Husserl's phenomenology, *The Problem of Genesis in Husserl's Philosophy*, but he critically broke away from the phenomenological tradition, and more famously and influentially set up shop as a *deconstructionist*.

Derrida's deconstructionism consists, at bottom, in a great many subtle variations on the following fairly straightforward five-step argument: [124]

1 Traditional metaphysics in general and Kant's metaphysics in particular is essentially the "metaphysics of presence," or the attempt to find objects, properties, facts, or principles that are directly, self-evidently, and infallibly given to the cognitive subject.

  The metaphysics of presence in turn presupposes "logocentrism," or the assumption of a unitary logic, syntax, and semantics underlying all languages and at the basis of all rationality.
2 But cognitive access to objects, properties, facts, and principles is necessarily mediated by language-in-use, which is also essentially open to multiple interpretations, some of which are inconsistent with other interpretations.
3 So the metaphysics of presence and logocentrism are both false, and rationality is inherently self-undermining or "undecidable" in roughly Kurt Gödel's sense of a proposition that is logically true if and only if it is logically false.

4 Therefore, traditional metaphysics in general and Kant's metaphysics in particular are impossible.

There are significant parallels between Derrida's deconstructionist argument against traditional metaphysics, and Quine's argument against the analytic/synthetic distinction from "the indeterminacy of translation."[125] But the crucial point for our purposes is that in *Edmund Husserl's Origin of Geometry: An Introduction* (1962) and in *Speech and Phenomena* (1967), in reverse order, Derrida applied the deconstructionist argument directly to Husserl's early logico-semantic phenomenology in *Logical Investigations* and to his later transcendental phenomenology in *Crisis*.

The basic thesis linking together both Derridean studies is that while phenomenology purports to criticize and replace traditional metaphysics in general and Kant's metaphysics in particular, it falls directly back into the metaphysics of presence and logocentrism. And then just like traditional metaphysics and Kant's metaphysics alike, phenomenology for that reason is ultimately impossible. As a consequence of this deconstructionist worry, together with a more sympathetic but in fact philosophically far more rigorous critique of Husserl's epistemology in 1974 by the Marxist philosopher Leszek Kolakowski (1927–) ironically enough, delivered as the Cassirer Lectures at Yale),[126] by the end of the 1970s phenomenology was widely regarded as a philosophical program that had come to an end. It survived only in the substantially downsized form of the exegetical historical-philosophical study of Husserl's texts and the texts of those significantly influenced by Husserl – in particular, the early Heidegger, early Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty. And unlike analytic philosophy, which closely linked its fate to that of the massively successful and culturally dominant exact sciences, phenomenology firmly rejected scientific or reductive naturalism at about mid-century, and so institutionally had largely withered away by the end of the twentieth century as well.[127]

Kantian themes in ethics

Kant, Moore again, and the naturalistic fallacy

Thus far we have been following the direct and indirect protean influences of Kant's Critical Philosophy on the mainstream of twentieth-century philosophy running from neo-Kantianism up through the European and Anglo-American analytic and phenomenological traditions. But this story concerns almost exclusively the role of Kant's metaphysics. What about the role of Kant's ethics?

One crucial difference between the role of Kant's metaphysics and the role of his ethics in twentieth-century philosophy is that whereas Kant's metaphysics is *the* original foundation of analytic philosophy and phenomenology alike, his ethics by sharp contrast always was (and still is) in direct competition with two other equally important moral traditions: (1) the *utilitarian consequentialist* tradition, which runs backwards through J. S. Mill and Jeremy Bentham to Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature* and second *Enquiry*, and (2) the *contractualist* tradition, which runs backwards through

Rousseau and Locke to Hobbes's *Leviathan*. Adequately narrating and then critically analyzing the philosophical story of the interplay between Kantian ethics, utilitarian consequentialism, and contractualism in the twentieth century would easily use up another chapter at least as long as this one. Nevertheless, two scenes from that story are directly relevant to the present account.

The first scene comes from the first decade of the century, and concerns Moore's seminal treatise in moral theory, *Principia Ethica* (see also "Twentieth-century moral philosophy," Chapter 20). The *Principia* is a characteristically ingenious and intensely passionate attempt to combine various elements of Henry Sidgwick's and J. S. Mill's utilitarian consequentialist (that is, hedonic, instrumentalist, and results-oriented) ethics with Kant's deontological (that is, duty-based, non-instrumentalist, and intentions-oriented) ethics. Moore does this by way of a radical critique of what he calls ethical "naturalism":

> [Naturalism] consists in substituting for "good" some one property of a natural object or of a collection of natural objects; and in thus replacing Ethics by some one of the natural sciences. In general, the science thus substituted is one of the sciences specially concerned with man. … In general, Psychology has been the science substituted, as by J. S. Mill.[128]

And his objection centers on the "naturalistic fallacy":

> [T]he naturalistic fallacy … [is] the fallacy which consists in identifying the simple notion which we mean by "good" with some other notion.[129]

> [The naturalistic] fallacy, I explained, consists in the contention that good *means* nothing but some simple or complex notion, that can defined in terms of natural qualities.[130]

In other words, according to Moore ethical naturalism is the claim that the property[131] of being good is identical with some simple or complex natural property (i.e. either a first-order physical property or a sensory experiential property); and the naturalistic fallacy consists precisely in accepting such an identification of properties. So far, so good – awful pun intended. Here Moore has clearly assimilated and further refined Kant's sharp and irreducible distinctions between the categorically normative *ought* and the factual *is*, and between the categorical norm of *altruism* and the empirical psychology of *self-interest*. And virtually all post-Moorean analytic ethicists have accepted Moore's characterization of ethical naturalism as well as his anti-naturalistic conclusions. So in this way, Kantian ethics covertly belongs to the foundations of all twentieth-century moral theories, of any conceivable stripe. But now for the sad part of the story.

Moore's basic argument in support of the putative fallaciousness of the naturalistic fallacy – the "open question argument" – is generally held to be a notorious failure. Here is his argument:

The hypothesis that disagreement about the meaning of good is disagreement with regard to the correct analysis of a given whole, may be most plainly seen to be incorrect by consideration of the fact that, whatever definition be offered, it may always be asked, with significance, of the complex so defined, whether it is itself good.[132]

We must not, therefore, be frightened by the assertion that a thing is natural into the admission that it is good: good does not, by definition, mean anything that is natural; and it is always an open question whether what is natural is good.[133]

For convenience, I will call the fundamental ethical property of being good, "the Good." The open question argument says that any attempt to explain the Good solely in terms of some corresponding natural property N (say, the property of being a pleasurable state of mind), automatically falls prey to the decisive objection that even if X is an instance of N it can still be significantly asked whether X is good: that is, it can be significantly postulated that X is an instance of N but X is not good. Moore's rationale for this is that the only case in which it would be altogether nonsensical to postulate that X is an instance of N but X is not good, is the case in which it is strictly impossible or contradictory to hold that X is not good, that is, when X is, precisely, good. So if it is significant to ask whether X is N but not good, then N is not identical to the Good. And Moore finds it to be invariably the case that it is significant to ask whether X is N but not good, hence invariably the case that N is not identical to the Good. He concludes that the Good is an indefinable or unanalyzable non-natural property, and that it is a fallacy to try to identify the Good with any natural property.

The open question argument is doomed because of a mistake Moore has made about the individuation of properties. The problem is that the argument implies a criterion of property-identity that is absurdly strict.[134] Familiar criteria of identity for two properties include equivalence of analytic definition, synonymy of their corresponding predicates, and identity of their cross-possible-worlds extensions. But Moore's criterion is importantly different:

[W]hoever will attentively consider with himself what is actually before his mind when he asks the question "Is pleasure (or whatever it may be) after all good?" can easily satisfy himself that he is not merely wondering whether pleasure is pleasant. And if he will try this experiment with each suggested definition in succession, he may become expert enough to recognise that in every case he has before his mind a unique object, with regard to the connection of which with any other object, a distinct question can be asked. Everyone does in fact understand the question "Is this good?" When he thinks of it, his state of mind is different from what it would be, were he asked "Is this pleasant, or desired, or approved?" It has a distinct meaning for him, even though he may not recognize in what respect it is distinct. Whenever he thinks of "intrinsic value," or "intrinsic worth," or says that a thing "ought

to exist," he has before his mind the unique object – the unique property of things – which I mean by "good". … "Good," then is indefinable.[135]

Moore's criterion is that two properties are identical if and only if the intentional contents of the states of mind in which the properties are recognized, are phenomenally indistinguishable. Moore seems to have inherited the phenomenal criterion of the identity of properties from his teacher Ward, who in turn inherited it from Brentano, thus by an ironic twist returning us full-circle to psychologism. Consequently, even two properties that are by hypothesis definitionally equivalent – for example, the property of being a bachelor, and the property of being an adult unmarried male – will come out non-identical according to this test. The intentional content of the state of mind of someone who says or thinks that X is a bachelor is clearly phenomenally distinguishable from that of the same person when she says or thinks that X is an adult unmarried male. I might not wonder even for a split second whether a bachelor is a bachelor, yet find myself mentally double-clutching as to whether a bachelor is an unmarried adult male. But then according to that test it is not nonsensical to ask whether X is an unmarried adult male but not a bachelor – from which we must conclude by Moorean reasoning that the property of being a bachelor is indefinable, and that it is a fallacy to try to identify any property with any other property, *including the property which expresses its definition*. Obviously this cannot be correct: it is patently absurd to constrain property identity so very, very tightly.[136] Moore has clearly confused what Kant carefully separated: (1) the phenomenal content of inner sense and (2) the intensional content of concepts.[137] (See also the section "Kant, Husserl, phenomenology, and philosophical logic," above.)

From the standpoint of Kantian ethics however the result is far more dire, since Moore's mistake seems to cast doubt on the fundamental Kantian ought/is and altruism/self-interest distinctions that had originally motivated Moore's attack on the naturalistic fallacy. Yet we must not confuse the messenger with the message. For Kant, as we saw in the section "Kant's metaphysics," above, these distinctions have an independent foundation in our innate spontaneous mental capacity of pure practical reason.

Kantian ethics after Rawls

The second scene from the story of Kant's ethics in twentieth-century philosophy comes from the period after 1950. The dominant figure in moral philosophy during this period was the Harvard philosopher John Rawls (1921–2002), whose *Theory of Justice* (1971) had an impact on post-World War II moral and political theory fully comparable to that of his departmental colleague Quine's earlier paper "Two dogmas" on postwar semantics, epistemology, and metaphysics. (For further discussion of Rawls, see "Twentieth-century political philosophy," Chapter 21.)

But unlike "Two dogmas," yet very like Strawson's *Individuals*, and again also very like the influential theory of "communicative ethics" developed in the same period by Jürgen Habermas (1929–),[138] Rawls's *Theory of Justice* is in fundamental ways a

work firmly embedded in the Kantian tradition.[139] Just as Moore had attempted to combine utilitarian consequentialism with Kant's ethics, so Rawls's project was to combine contractualism with Kant's ethics. This lead Rawls to two basic ideas. The first basic idea is that the first principles of morality are indeed categorical or unconditional and non-instrumental just as Kant had argued, but also essentially *procedural* or *constructive*, not substantive (more on this in a moment). The second basic idea is that Kantian moral principles are not grasped either by Kantian pure practical reason or by a Moorean intuition of the Good, but instead are to be generated by a contractualist methodology which asks what a group of rational human participants in a social contract *would* agree to, by way of a set of procedural principles of justice-as-fairness, on the purely hypothetical assumption (called "the veil of ignorance") that the actual identities and worldly circumstances of the participants in the contract-forming assembly are not known.

Rawls's veil-of-ignorance methodology is not dissimilar to Husserl's *epoché* (see pp. 000–0), although in an intersubjective rather than a solipsistic context. But the crucial point for our purposes is the idea that the Kantian first principles of morality are essentially procedural or constructive, and not substantive. This important Rawlsian idea has been further developed by several of Rawls's students, most notably Thomas Hill,[140] Christine Korsgaard (1952–),[141] and Onora O'Neill (1941–),[142] both as a way of interpreting Kant's Categorical Imperative (which I have also adopted in the section "Kant's metaphysics") and as a way of doing Kantian ethics.

According to O'Neill, it is a great mistake to think of the Categorical Imperative (CI) as a superstrong first-order principle for action or a super-maxim, that is, as an all-purpose practical decision-procedure or algorithm. On the contrary, the CI is a second-order procedural principle applying universally to first-order maxims. Negatively described, the CI is a filter for screening out bad maxims; positively described, the CI is a constructive protocol for correctly generating maxims, given the multifarious array of concrete input-materials to practical reasoning, that is, beliefs, desires, habits, personal situation, social-historical context, and so on. Thus the CI says, roughly:

> Act *only* according to those maxims that every rational human being could adopt, and that thereby remain consistent with our innate rational capacity for constructing and acting upon maxims.

The crucial point here is that we cannot say in advance of actual practical reasoning processes just *which* maxims will turn out to be permissible or obligatory, but we can know a priori that any maxim that will count as action-guiding *must* have a format or structure that is determined by the CI.

When it is construed in this way as essentially procedural or constructive, the CI functions not only as a categorically normative first principle of moral reasoning, but also as a categorically normative first principle of logical reasoning:

> The Categorical Imperative is the supreme principle of reasoning not because it is an algorithm either for thought or for action, but because it

is an indispensable strategy for disciplining thinking or action in ways that are not contingent on specific and variable circumstances. The Categorical Imperative is a fundamental strategy, not an algorithm; it is the fundamental strategy not just of morality but *of all activity that counts as reasoned.* The supreme principle of reason is merely the principle of thinking and acting on principles that can (not "do") hold for all.[143]

O'Neill is saying that the basis for the construction of any rational scheme of principles, whether that scheme is to be thought-guiding (logic) or intentional-action-guiding (morality), is the CI. As applied to intentional action, the CI says that any first-order action-guiding principle must be universalizable, non-exploitative, and so on. But when it is applied to thought, the CI says that every reasoning process must satisfy some minimal principle of logical consistency. For example, let us consider what I will call "the Weak Law of Non-Contradiction," which says that *not every proposition is both true and false.* [144] The CI as applied to logical reasoning then says:

> Think *only* according to those processes of logical reasoning every rational human being could adopt, and that thereby satisfy the Weak Law of Non-Contradiction.

But Kantian moral constructivism does not exhaust Kantian ethics. According to Hill, these are its main theoretical commitments:

1 "Kantian ethics is primarily *addressed to concerns we have as rational moral agents,* as we deliberate conscientiously about what we ought to do."
2 "Moral 'oughts' purport to express categorical imperatives or judgments based on these … [and] these express *rational constraints on choice* that are not grounded in either the need to take necessary means to one's particular contingent ends or one's general desire for happiness."
3 "Categorical imperatives and the moral judgments derived from them express rational prescriptions in a vocabulary of constraint ('must', 'bound', 'obligatory', 'duty', 'Do it!') that reflects how recognizing a rational moral requirement is experienced by those ('imperfect wills') who know that they can satisfy the requirement but also know that they can and might violate the requirement and choose instead to pursue some conflicting desire-based end."
4 "Moral 'oughts' express a deep, self-identifying, and inescapable disposition of moral agents, who have reason and autonomy of will, to acknowledge certain considerations as overridingly authoritative and so internally binding."
5 "It is a fundamental moral principle that humanity in each person is to be regarded as an end in itself."
6 "We can think of the policies and acts that would be acceptable for everyone, in the relevant sense, as just those policies and acts that would conform to the 'universal laws' that moral legislators would accept if trying to work out a reasonable system of moral principles under certain ideal conditions ('the kingdom/realm of ends')."

7 "These general principles are supposed to establish a strong presumption against willful deception and manipulation."
8 "When thinking from a practical moral perspective rather than an empirical scientific perspective, we conceive typical human actions as done intentionally – for reasons – by agents presumed capable of choosing to act differently."
9 "In human beings, practical judgments and feelings are not usually separable."[145]

It is obvious enough how this set of commitments both refines and extends Kant's ethics (see "Kant's metaphysics," above). There is, however, in this connection a fairly serious problem with the eighth theoretical commitment. What would Kant himself say about it? Presumably something like this: The fact that from a practical perspective, as opposed to a scientific perspective, we must *conceive* of ourselves as acting intentionally for reasons, in such a way that we could also have acted differently if we had recognized that we morally ought to, is of course perfectly consistent with our being *falsely* so conceived. If that conception is false, then there really is no such thing as practical freedom or autonomy. Yet in that case our everyday lives as lived from the inside are nothing but a tragic metaphysical hoax, for every sane person is a "phenomenal libertarian" for whom it at least *feels as if* ordinary choices are such that she could have willed or done otherwise. Furthermore, our autonomy or practical freedom and along with it our noumenal ability to will or do otherwise are both required by the very nature of morality to be *real*, not merely self-conceptions that we have to believe in. In this way it appears that the thesis of "soft determinism," or *compatibilism*, which says that "internal" or "agent-centered" freedom of the will and moral responsibility are consistent with a complete actual inability to will or do otherwise in view of the universal deterministic or indeterministic mechanism of the natural world, *cannot* be the metaphysical basis of a truly Kantian ethics. The free will must have real causal efficacy, or else we are not the persons we seem to be.

Conclusion

Despite the sobering fact that the two major philosophical traditions of the twentieth century – as someone wittily wrote about the history of the nineteenth century – began with *Great Expectations* but ended with *Lost Illusions*, a positive moral can nevertheless be extracted from this otherwise downbeat story. Both analytic philosophy and phenomenology *could* renew themselves in the twenty-first century by critically recovering their Kantian origins, and by rethinking and rebuilding their own foundations in the light of this critical recovery.

What I mean is this. Analytic philosophers *could* directly engage with Kant's two revolutionary ideas (1) that natural science is ultimately all about the intrinsic structures and causal functions of a directly humanly perceivable macrophysical empirical reality, not about microphysical noumena and their humanly unobservable non-relational essences (this is what I called Kant's *manifest realism*), and (2) that the exact sciences presuppose and are inherently constrained by rational human nature, and all theoretical reasoning including pure logic and mathematics is categorically

normative at its basis, because practical rationality is explanatorily and ontologi-cally prior to theoretical rationality (let us call this *the priority of practical reason over theoretical reason*).[146] Correspondingly, phenomenologists *could* also directly engage with Kant's equally revolutionary ideas (a) that inner sense (temporal phenomenal consciousness) and outer sense (spatial embodied consciousness) are necessarily inter-dependent, and (b) that the intentionality of the mind is continuous with biological life. So phenomenologists could face up to the thoughts that there is no such thing as an ontologically independent, epistemically infallible, world-constituting Cartesian/ Kantian transcendental ego, and that the rational human mind is nothing more and nothing less than the activating form of the living human animal fully embedded in its worldly environment and fully engaged in all its ordinary practices.[147]

In these ways, it seems at least possible that the seemingly unbridgeable explanatory and ontological gaps that opened up in mid- and late-twentieth century philosophy between the basic subject matters of post-Quinean analysis (that is, the noumenal micro-world described by mathematical physics) and classical phenomenology (that is, consciousness or subjective experience, and intentionality)[148] could ultimately close themselves up and become a single integrated set of facts about rational human animals and their macrophysical world. If so, this would in effect solve the two images problem without in any way reducing or eliminating the manifest image.

Kant dealt with essentially the same clash of fundamental philosophical images under the rubrics of *nature* and *freedom*.[149] And in this way a partial anticipation of Kant's strategy for integrating the two images can be found in Kantian ethics.[150] Here the indissoluble fusion of the concepts of (1) mind as the embodied locus of cognitive, affective, and volitional capacities, (2) intentional action, (3) basic human practices (including language and exact science), (4) the sharp modal distinction between instrumental or hypothetical normativity and non-instrumental or categorical norma-tivity, (5) logic as the non-instrumentally or categorically normative science of theoretical rationality, and (6) constructivist moral theory as the non-instrumentally or categorically normative science of practical rationality, aptly captures the sense in which the analytic and phenomenological traditions could together rejoin, refor-mulate, and recover Kant's notion of philosophy as a self-critical *rational anthropology* (JL 9:25–6).

So it appears – to echo the famous opening lines of the first *Critique* – that twenty-first century philosophy *has the peculiar fate*, that either it will eventually achieve genuine autonomy as a form of rational anthropology in the Kantian sense, more or less along the lines projected by Kantian ethics, or else it will inwardly perish and become no more than a subdepartment of the exact sciences. But the choice of which it is to be, is entirely up to us.

Notes

1 Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, p. 39.
2 For convenience, I cite Kant's works infratextually in parentheses. The citations include both an abbreviation of the English title and the corresponding volume and page numbers in the standard

"Akademie" edition of Kant's works: *Kants gesammelte Schriften*, edited by the Königlich Preussischen (now Deutschen) Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: G. Reimer (now de Gruyter), 1902–). I generally follow the standard English translations, but have occasionally modified them where appropriate. For references to the first *Critique*, I follow the common practice of giving page numbers from the A (1781) and B (1787) German editions only. Here is a list of the relevant abbreviations and English translations.

A *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View,* trans. M. Gregor. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974.

CPJ *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, trans. P. Guyer and E. Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

CPR *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

CPrR *Critique of Practical Reason*, trans. L. W. Beck. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1956.

CPrR *Critique of Practical Reason*, trans. M. Gregor. In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. 133–272.

GMM *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* trans. M. Gregor. In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 37–108.

IUH "Idea of a universal history of mankind from a cosmopolitan point of view." In *Kant on History*, trans. L. W. Beck, New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963, pp. 11–26.

JL "The Jäsche logic." In *Immanuel Kant: Lectures on Logic*, trans. J. M. Young, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp. 519–640.

LE *Lectures on Ethics*, trans. P. Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

MFNS *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science*, trans. J. Ellington. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.

MM *Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. M. Gregor. In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 353–604.

OP *Opus postumum*, trans. E. Förster and M. Rosen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

P *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, trans. J. Ellington. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1977.

PC *Immanuel Kant: Philosophical Correspondence, 1759–99*, trans. A. Zweig. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Rel *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*, trans. A. Wood and G. Di Giovanni. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

3 See, e.g., Hanna, *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*, esp. ch. 3; Proust, *Questions of Form: Logic and the Analytic Proposition*; and Soames, *Philosophical Analysis in the Twentieth Century*, esp. vol. 1.

4 See, e.g., Moran, *Introduction to Phenomenology*; and Spiegelberg (with Schuhmann), *The Phenomenological Movement*.

5 In this chapter for simplicity's sake I am using the notions of a proposition, an assertoric judgment, an indicative sentence, and a statement interchangeably.

6 Kant distinguishes carefully between (1) "cognition" (*Erkenntnis*), or the conscious mental representation of objects (*CPR* A320/B376), which does *not* strictly imply either belief, truth, or justification (*CPR* A58–9/B83), and (2) "scientific knowing" (*Wissen*), which *does* strictly implies belief, truth, and justification (*CPR* A820–31/B848–59). From this simple terminological point however, it follows that to the considerable extent that the first *Critique* is all about the nature, scope, and limits of human *Erkenntnis*, then it is fundamentally a treatise in cognitive semantics, and *not* fundamentally a treatise in epistemology. See Hanna, *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*, esp. pp. 18 and 30.

7 See Abela, *Kant's Empirical Realism*; and Hanna, *Kant, Science, and Human Nature*, chs. 1–4.

8 See Hanna, *Kant, Science, and Human Nature*, chs. 5–8.

9 Sellars, "Empiricism and the philosophy of mind," p. 173.

10 But see Wood, *Kant's Ethical Thought*, p. 288.

11 See Grimm, "Kant's argument for radical evil."

12 See Beck, "Neo-Kantianism"; and Köhnke, *The Rise of Neo-Kantianism*.

13 See Soames, *Philosophical Analysis in the Twentieth Century*, esp. vol. 2, pp. 461–76.

14 See, e.g., Coffa, *The Semantic Tradition from Kant to Carnap*; and Hanna, *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*.

15 Brentano, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, book I.

16 James, *Principles of Psychology*, vol. 1, ch. IX.

17 Brentano, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, pp. 88–91.

18 Ibid., p. 91.

19 Ibid., p. 81.

20 Ibid., pp. 83–5.

21 In other words, mental phenomena in Brentano's sense are *phenomenal qualia*. See Dennett, "Quining qualia."

22 Frege, "Review of E. G. Husserl, *Philosophie der Arithmetik I*."

23 Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, vol. 1, p. 122n.

24 Ibid., vol. 2, p. 527.

25 Unlike Husserl, Frege does not think it is possible to hold the sense of a linguistic expression fixed, and vary the reference. But this is only a superficial difference, since Husserl's examples exploit either the semantic phenomenon of multiple applications of the same predicate ("is a dog" can be multiply applied to Asta, Bullet, or Lassie) or the semantic phenomenon of multiple reference under the same indexical ("I" can multiply refer to Tom, Dick, or Harriet as token-reflexively uttered by each), neither of which, presumably, Frege would upon reflection really want to reject.

26 This is made clear in the second edition version of the Introduction to vol. 2 of the *Logical Investigations*, which was published in 1913.

27 Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, vol. 2, p. 549.

28 Ibid., p. 549, n. 1.

29 See Moran, "Making sense: Husserl's phenomenology as transcendental idealism."

30 See Weatherston, *Heidegger's Interpretation of Kant*.

31 This idea heavily influenced Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics in *Truth and Method*; see Moran, *Introduction to Phenomenology*, ch. 8.

32 See Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*, part two.

33 See, e.g., Bell and Cooper, *The Analytic Tradition*; Dummett, *Origins of Analytical Philosophy*; French et al., *The Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*; Hanna, *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*; Pap, *Elements of Analytic Philosophy*; Soames, *Philosophical Analysis in the Twentieth Century*; and Tugendhat, *Traditional and Analytical Philosophy*, esp. part I.

34 See Frege, *Begriffschrift*; Frege, *Foundations of Arithmetic* and *Basic Laws of Arithmetic*. According to Frege in the *Foundations*, a proposition is analytic if and only if it is either provable from a general law of logic alone, or else provable from general laws of logic plus "logical definitions." One problem with this account is that unless general laws of logic are provable from themselves, they do not strictly speaking count as analytic. Another and more serious problem is that the precise semantic and epistemic status of logical definitions was never adequately clarified or settled by Frege; see Benacerraf, "Frege: the last logicist." But the most serious problem is that Frege's set theory contains an apparently insoluble contradiction discovered by Russell in 1901, as a direct consequence of the unrestricted set-formation axiom in Frege's *Basic Laws of Arithmetic*: *Russell's Paradox*, which says that the set of all sets not members of themselves is a member of itself if and only if it is not a member of itself.

35 See Frege, *Foundations of Arithmetic*, pp. 101–2; and Frege, "Foundations of geometry," pp. 22–6.

36 See Langford, "The notion of analysis in Moore's philosophy." Moorean analysis is best examplified in *Principia Ethica* and the essays later collected in his *Philosophical Studies* (1922).

37 See Levy, *Moore: G. E. Moore and the Cambridge Apostles*.

38 See Ward, "Psychology."

39 Moore, *Principia Ethica*, pp. x–xi.

40 See Hanna, *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*, pp. 55–6.

41 Moore, *Principia Ethica*, p. xx.

42 See Baldwin, *G. E. Moore*, chs. I–II.

43 Keynes, "My early beliefs," p. 94. The Cambridge Apostles were (and still are) a highly-selective Cambridge secret debating society. See also Levy, *G. E. Moore and the Cambridge Apostles*.

44 Phenomenalistic interpretations of Kant's idealism have been around, and possibly even dominant, from at least the time of the Christian Garve-Johann Feder review of the first *Critique* in 1782. See

also, e.g., Strawson, *The Bounds of Sense*; and Van Cleve, *Problems from Kant*. Most of the many changes made by Kant in the B edition of 1987 were directed against this interpretation.

45 See Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*. Carroll was really Arthur Dodgson, an Oxford logician and contemporary of Moore and Russell.

46 See Meinong, "The theory of objects."

47 See Hylton, *Russell, Idealism, and the Emergence of Analytic Philosophy*.

48 Moore, "Review of Russell's *Essay on the Foundations of Geometry*."

49 See Russell, *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*, pp. 169–70.

50 See Monk, *Bertrand Russell*, part I.

51 Russell, *Principles of Mathematics*, p. 4.

52 See Russell, "Knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description."

53 See Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy*, ch. 5.

54 Russell, *My Philosophical Development*, pp. 14–15.

55 Russell, *Autobiography*, p. 330.

56 See Eames, "Introduction," in Russell, *Theory of Knowledge*, pp. xiv–xx.

57 Russell, *Autobiography*, p. 282.

58 See Russell, "The philosophy of logical atomism."

59 Wittgenstein told G. H. von Wright that "he had read Schopenhauer's *Die Welt as Wille und Vorstellung* in his youth and that his first philosophy was Schopenhauerian epistemological idealism" (von Wright, "Biographical sketch of Wittgenstein," p. 6). This is also fully explicit in Wittgenstein's *Notebooks 1914–1916*. See also Brockhaus, *Pulling Up the Ladder: The Metaphysical Roots of Wittgenstein's* Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus.

60 Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value*, p. 10e.

61 See, e.g., Diamond, *The Realistic Spirit: Wittgenstein, Philosophy, and the Mind*.

62 Wittgenstein read the *Critique of Pure Reason* in 1919 while interned as a POW at Como in Italy. See Monk, *Ludwig Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius*, p. 158.

63 As quoted in Brockhaus, *Pulling Up the Ladder: The Metaphysical Roots of Wittgenstein's* Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, p. 296.

64 See Kuehn, *Kant: A Biography*, ch. 5.

65 Carnap, "Intellectual autobiography," pp. 4 and 12.

66 See Rorty, *The Linguistic Turn*, esp. the editor's Introduction.

67 See Richardson, *Carnap and the Construction of the World*.

68 See Friedman, *Reconsidering Logical Positivism*; Passmore, "Logical positivism"; and Waismann, *Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle*.

69 Carnap, "The elimination of metaphysics through the logical analysis of language."

70 Schlick, "Is there a factual a priori?"

71 See Hanna, *Rationality and Logic*, ch. 3; and Ricketts, "Frege, the *Tractatus*, and the logocentric predicament."

72 Cassirer's version of neo-Kantianism is both science-oriented and neo-Hegelian, and later had an important impact on American philosophy when Cassirer taught at Yale during the Nazi period.

73 See Friedman, *A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, and Heidegger*.

74 Friedman, *A Parting of the Ways*, p. 5.

75 See Cassirer, "Kant and the problem of metaphysics"; and Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*.

76 See Friedman, *A Parting of the Ways*, esp. ch. 9.

77 Ibid., chs. 7–8.

78 Ibid., ch. 2.

79 See Wittgenstein, "On Heidegger on being and dread."

80 See Ryle, "Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*."

81 Dummett, *Origins of Analytical Philosophy*, p. ix.

82 See Carnap, "The elimination of metaphysics through the logical analysis of language" (1932) and *Pseudoproblems in Philosophy* (1928); Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (1929) and "What is metaphysics?" (1929).

83 See Rorty, *Consequences of Pragmatism*.

84   See Hacker, *Wittgenstein's Place in Twentieth-Century Philosophy*, ch. 5; and Hanna, "Kant, Wittgenstein, and the fate of analysis."

85   See Sluga, *Heidegger's Crisis: Philosophy and Politics in Nazi Germany*.

86   Carnap refused to sign an oath of allegiance, which was required of all faculty at UCLA in the wake of McCarthyism. See also Carnap, "Intellectual autobiography," pp. 81–4.

87   See McCumber, *Time in the Ditch: American Philosophy and the McCarthy Era*.

88   See Judt, *Past Imperfect: French Intellectuals 1944–1956*.

89   See Wilshire, *Fashionable Nihilism: A Critique of Analytic Philosophy*, chs. 1–4.

90   Quine also offers another argument against the analytic/synthetic distinction, from the indeterminacy of translation, in *Word and Object*, ch. II. For a critique of this argument, see Katz, *The Metaphysics of Meaning*, ch. 5.

91   Quine, "Two dogmas of empiricism," p. 37.

92   See Hanna, *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*, ch. 5.

93   See ibid., ch. 3.

94   Katz, *Cogitations*, pp. 28–32.

95   Grice and Strawson, "In defense of a dogma."

96   See Hanna, *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*, pp. 175–80; and Strawson, "Propositions, concepts, and logical truths."

97   Burge, "Philosophy of language and mind: 1950–1990," pp. 9–10.

98   See Hacker, *Wittgenstein's Place in Twentieth-Century Philosophy*, ch. 7.

99   See Strawson, *Analysis and Metaphysics*.

100 See Hanna, *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*, ch. 3 and "Kant's theory of judgment."

101 This is my own formulation. For other versions, see Stern, *Transcendental Arguments: Problems and Prospects*.

102 See Stern, *Transcendental Arguments and Skepticism*. See also Hanna, "The inner and the outer: Kant's 'Refutation' reconstructed."

103 See Strawson, *Individuals*, p. 40.

104 See Strawson, *Analysis and Metaphysics*.

105 See Stroud, *The Significance of Philosophical Skepticism*, ch. 4 and "Transcendental arguments."

106 See Putnam, *The Many Faces of Realism*; and McDowell, *Mind and World*.

107 Sellars, "Philosophy and the scientific image of man."

108 See, e.g., Danto, "Naturalism"; Friedman, "Philosophical naturalism"; McDowell, "Two sorts of naturalism"; Maddy, "Naturalism and the a priori"; Papineau, *Philosophical Naturalism*; and Stroud, "The charm of naturalism."

109 See Quine, "Two dogmas of empiricism" and *Word and Object*, esp. chs. 2 and 6.

110 See Sellars, *Science, Perception, and Reality*.

111 See Sellars, *Science and Metaphysics: Variations on Kantian Themes*. The primary influence on twentieth-century Kantian epistemology and metaphysics in North America was C. I. Lewis at Harvard, both through his own writings and those of his best Ph.D. students, especially Lewis White Beck and Sellars. (In the latter half of the century John Rawls, also at Harvard, exerted a similar influence on Kantian ethics. See the section "Kantian ethics after Rawls.") In 1929 Lewis published his highly influential neo-Kantian epistemological treatise, *Mind and the World Order*. In 1936, *Mind and the World Order* was the first contemporary philosophical text ever to be taught at Oxford, in a seminar run by J. L. Austin and Isaiah Berlin. Sellars attended this Oxford seminar, started a D.Phil. dissertation on Kant with T. D. Weldon the same year, and then later transferred to Harvard, where he wrote his Ph.D dissertation on Kant with Lewis.

112 Davidson, "On the very idea of a conceptual scheme."

113 See McDowell, "Having the world in view: Sellars, Kant, and intentionality" and *Mind and World*.

114 See Sellars, "Empiricism and the philosophy of mind."

115 See Hanna, "Kant and nonconceptual content."

116 See McDowell, "Two sorts of naturalism."

117 See Sedgwick, "McDowell's Hegelianism."

118 See Churchland, *Scientific Realism and the Plasticity of Mind*.

119 See Fogelin, "Quine's limited naturalism"; Johnsen, "How to read 'Epistemology naturalized'"; and Quine, "Epistemology naturalized."

120 See Hanna, "A Kantian critique of scientific essentialism"; Kripke, "Identity and necessity" and *Naming and Necessity*; Putnam, "Explanation and reference," "Is semantics possible?" and "The meaning of 'meaning'"; and Soames, *Philosophical Analysis in the Twentieth Century*, vol. 2, chs. 14—17.

121 Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value*, p. 56e.

122 As Kant notes in the Fourth Paralogism, Cartesian skepticism is the direct consequence of "transcendental" or noumenal realism (*CPR* A366–80).

123 Hard or incompatibilist determinism, which says that "there is no freedom, but everything in the world happens solely in accordance with laws of nature," is spelled out by Kant in the Antithesis of the Third Antinomy (*CPR* A445–51/B473–9).

124 See Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, pp. 97–8; and Moran, *Introduction to Phenomenology*, pp. 444–53.

125 See Quine, *Word and Object*, ch. II.

126 See Kolakowski, *Husserl and the Search for Certitude*.

127 See, e.g., Wilshire, *Fashionable Nihilism: A Critique of Analytic Philosophy*.

128 Moore, *Principia Ethica*, p. 40.

129 Ibid., p. 58.

130 Ibid., p. 73.

131 Moore fails to distinguish between concepts and properties, and again between properties and predicates. See Bealer, *Quality and Concept*; Oliver, "The metaphysics of properties"; and Putnam, "On properties." This is of course controversial territory. For my purposes here I will make the fairly standard assumptions that concepts are intersubjectively-accessible psychological intensional entities whose identity criterion is definitional equivalence; that predicates are linguistic intensional entities whose identity criterion is synonymy; and that properties are non-psychological, non-linguistic intensional entities whose identity criterion is sharing cross-possible-worlds extensions. Predicates express concepts as their meanings, and concepts pick out corresponding properties in the world. For convenience, however, in the following discussion of Moore's argument against ethical naturalism I will allow "property" to range over all three sorts of intensional entity. The flaws in his argument will persist no matter which sort of intensional entity is at issue.

132 Moore, *Principia Ethica*, p. 15.

133 Ibid., p. 44.

134 Indeed Moore adopts Bishop Butler's Monty-Pythonesque dictum, "everything is what it is and not another thing," as the motto of *Principia Ethica*, and also uses it repeatedly as an axiom in his arguments.

135 Moore, *Principia Ethica*, pp. 16–17.

136 Moreover the phenomenal criterion of property identity leads directly to the paradox of analysis: If only *phenomenal* identity will suffice for property identity, and property identity is a necessary condition of a correct analysis, then every correct analysis must be epistemically trivial. See Langford, "The notion of analysis in Moore's philosophy"; and Moore's reply to Langford, "Analysis."

137 See also Hanna, "How do we know necessary truths? Kant's answer."

138 See McCarthy, *The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas*, esp. pp. 325–7.

139 See Rawls, "A Kantian conception of equality," "Kantian constructivism in moral theory," and "Themes in Kant's moral theory."

140 See Hill, *Autonomy and Self-Respect*, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, "Kantian constructivism in ethics," *Human Welfare and Moral Worth*, and *Respect, Pluralism, and Justice*.

141 See Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends* and *The Sources of Normativity*.

142 See O'Neill (Nell), *Acting on Principle*; and O'Neill, *Constructions of Reason*, ch. 11.

143 O'Neill, *Constructions of Reason*, pp. 58–9, emphasis added.

144 See Hanna, *Rationality and Logic*, ch. 7; and Putnam, "There is at least one a priori truth."

145 See Hill, *Human Welfare and Moral Worth*, pp. 367–70, numbering slightly altered.

146 See Hanna, *Kant, Science, and Human Nature*.

147 The later Husserl in fact sketched a view quite similar to this in *Ideas II* and the *Crisis*. See Smith, "Mind and body."

148 See, e.g., Nagel, "What is it like to be a bat?"; and Chalmers, *The Conscious Mind.*
149 See Ameriks, *Kant and the Fate of Autonomy* and "Kant on science and common knowledge"; and Guyer, *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom.*
150 Another partial anticipation of rational anthropology in the Kantian sense can be found in the philosophy of the later Wittgenstein; see Hanna, "Kant, Wittgenstein, and the fate of analysis."

References

Abela, P., *Kant's Empirical Realism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Ameriks, K., *Kant and the Fate of Autonomy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

—— "Kant on science and common knowledge." In E. Watkins (ed.) *Kant and the Sciences*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 31—52.

Ayer, A. J., *Language, Truth, and Logic*, 2nd edn. New York: Dover, 1952.

Baldwin, T., *G. E. Moore.* London: Routledge, 1990.

Bealer, G., *Quality and Concept.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Beck, L. W.,"Neo-Kantianism." In P. Edwards (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 5, New York: Macmillan, 1967, pp. 468–73.

Bell, D. and N. Cooper (eds.) *The Analytic Tradition.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

Benacerraf, P., "Frege: the last logicist." In P. French et al. (eds.) *The Foundations of Analytic Philosophy, Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 6, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981, pp. 17–35.

Bradley, F. H., *Principles of Logic.* London: G. E. Stechert, 1883.

Brentano, F., *On the Several Senses of Being in Aristotle*, trans. R. George. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

—— *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, trans. A. C. Rancurello et al. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

—— *The Origin of Our Knowledge of Right and Wrong,* trans. R. Chisholm and E. Schneewind. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.

Brockhaus, R., *Pulling Up the Ladder: The Metaphysical Roots of Wittgenstein's* Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1991.

Burge, T., "Philosophy of language and mind: 1950—1990." *Philosophical Review* 101 (1992): 3–51.

Carnap, R., "Intellectual autobiography." In P. Schilpp (ed.) *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1963, pp. 3–84.

—— *Pseudoproblems in Philosophy*, trans. R. George. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

—— "The elimination of metaphysics through logical analysis of language." In A. J. Ayer (ed.) *Logical Positivism*, New York: Free Press, 1959, pp. 60–81.

—— *The Logical Structure of the World*, trans. R. George. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

—— *The Logical Syntax of Language.* London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1937.

Carroll, L., *Through the Looking Glass.* New York: Dial, 1988.

Cassirer, E., "Kant and the problem of metaphysics." In M. Gram (ed.) *Kant: Disputed Questions*, Chicago: Quadrangle, 1967.

—— *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, 3 vols, trans. R. Manheim. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955, 1957.

Chalmers, D., *The Conscious Mind.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Churchland, P. M., *Scientific Realism and the Plasticity of Mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Coffa, A., *The Semantic Tradition from Kant to Carnap.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Danto, A., "Naturalism." In P. Edwards (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 8 vols., New York: Macmillan, 1967, vol. 5, pp. 448—50.

Davidson, D., "On the very idea of a conceptual scheme." In *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984, pp. 183–98.

Dennett, D., "Quining qualia." In D. Chalmers (ed.) *Philosophy of Mind: Classical and Contemporary Readings*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. 226–46.

Derrida, J., *Edmund Husserl's Origin of Geometry: An Introduction*, trans. J. Leavey. Stony Brook, NY: Nicholas Hays, 1978.

—— *Of Grammatology*, trans. G. C. Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

—— *Speech and Phenomena*, trans. D. Allison. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

—— *The Problem of Genesis in Husserl's Philosophy*, published as: *La Problème de la genèse dans la philosophie de Husserl.* Paris: PUF, 1990.

Dewey, J., *Experience and Nature.* New York: Dover, 1929, 1958.

Diamond, C., *The Realistic Spirit: Wittgenstein, Philosophy, and the Mind.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.

Dummett, M., *Origins of Analytical Philosophy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Eames, E. R., "Introduction." In B. Russell, *Theory of Knowledge*, London: Routledge, 1992, pp. vii–xxxvii.

Edwards, P. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 7 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Fogelin, R., "Quine's limited naturalism." *Journal of Philosophy* 94 (1997): 543–63.

Frege, G., *Basic Laws of Arithmetic*, trans. M. Furth. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.

—— *Begriffschrift.* Halle: a/S, 1879.

—— *Foundations of Arithmetic*, trans. J. L. Austin, 2nd edn. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1953.

—— "On the foundations of geometry." In *On the Foundations of Geometry and Formal Theories of Arithmetic*, trans. E.-H. Kluge, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971, pp. 22–37, 49–112.

—— "Review of E. G. Husserl, *Philosophie der Arithmetik I.*" In *Collected Papers on Mathematics, Logic, and Philosophy*, trans. M. Black et al., Oxford: Blackwell, 1984.

Friedman, M., *A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, and Heidegger.* La Salle, IL: Open Court, 2000.

—— "Philosophical naturalism." *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 71 (1997): 7—21.

—— *Reconsidering Logical Positivism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

French, P. et al. (eds.) *The Foundations of Analytic Philosophy.* *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 6, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.

Gadamer, H.-G., *Truth and Method.* New York: Crossroad, 1982.

Goodman, N., *The Structure of Appearance*, 2nd edn. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Grimm, S., "Kant's argument for radical evil." *European Journal of Philosophy* 10 (2002): 160–77.

Grice, H. P. and P. F. Strawson, "In defense of a dogma." *Philosophical Review* 65 (1956): 141–58.

Guyer, P. (ed.) *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.

—— *The Cambridge Companion to Kant.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Hacker, P., *Wittgenstein's Place in Twentieth-Century Philosophy.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Hanna, R., "A Kantian critique of scientific essentialism." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 58 (1998): 497–528.

—— "How do we know necessary truths? Kant's answer." *European Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1998): 115–45.

—— "Kant and nonconceptual content." *European Journal of Philosophy* 13 (2005): 247–90.

—— *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.

—— *Kant, Science, and Human Nature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming.

—— "Kant's theory of judgment." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2004 Edition)*, ed. E. Zalta. http://plato.stanford.edu/archivesfall2004/entries/kant-judgment/.

—— "Kant, Wittgenstein, and the fate of analysis." In M. Beaney (ed.) *The Analytic Turn*, London: Routledge, forthcoming.

—— *Rationality and Logic.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, forthcoming.

—— "The inner and the outer: Kant's 'Refutation' reconstructed." *Ratio* 13 (2000): 146–74.

Heidegger, M., *Being and Time*, trans. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

—— *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, trans. R.Taft, 4th edn. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

—— *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's* Critique of Pure Reason, trans. P. Emad and K. Maly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

—— *The Theory of Judgment in Psychologism*, published as: *Die Lehre vom Urteil in Psychologismus.* Leipzig: Barth, 1914.

—— "What is metaphysics?" In J. G. Gray (ed.) *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings*, New York: Harper & Row, 1977, pp. 95–112.

Hill, T., *Autonomy and Self-Respect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

—— *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

—— *Human Welfare and Moral Worth: Kantian Perspectives*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

—— "Kantian constructivism in ethics" *Ethics* 99 (1989): 752–70.

—— *Respect, Pluralism, and Justice: Kantian Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Husserl, E., *Cartesian Meditations*, trans. D. Cairns. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1960.

—— *Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, trans. D. Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

—— *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, trans. D. Cairns. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1969.

—— *Idea of Phenomenology*, trans. W. P. Alston and G. Nahnikian. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1964.

—— *Ideas: A General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, trans. W. R. Boyce Gibson. London: Allen & Unwin, 1931.

—— *Logical Investigations*, 2 vols., trans. J. N. Findlay. London: Routledge, 1970.

—— *Philosophy of Arithmetic: Psychological and Logical Investigations*, vol. I, published as: *Philosophie der Arithmetik*, vol. 1. Halle: C. M. Pfeffer, 1891.

—— *Prolegomena to Pure Logic*. In *Logical Investigations*, vol. 1, trans. J. N. Findlay, London: Routledge: 1970.

Hylton, P., *Russell, Idealism, and the Emergence of Analytic Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

James, W., *Principles of Psychology*, 2 vols. New York: Dover, 1950.

Johnsen, B., "How to read 'Epistemology naturalized'." *Journal of Philosophy* 102 (2005): 78–93.

Judt, T., *Past Imperfect: French Intellectuals 1944—1956*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Katz, J., *Cogitations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

—— *The Metaphysics of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990.

Keynes, J. M., "My early beliefs." In *Two Memoirs*, London: R. Hart-Davis, 1949, pp. 78–103.

Köhnke, K., *The Rise of Neo-Kantianism*, trans. R. Hollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Kolakowski, L., *Husserl and the Search for Certitude*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1975.

Korsgaard, K., *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

—— *The Sources of Normativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Kripke, S., "Identity and necessity." In A. W. Moore (ed.) *Meaning and Reference*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 162–91.

—— *Naming and Necessity*, 2nd edn. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Kuehn, M., *Kant: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Langford, C. H., "The notion of analysis in Moore's philosophy." In P. Schilpp (ed.) *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*, 2nd edn., New York: Tudor, 1952, pp. 321–42.

Liebmann, O. *Kant und die Epigonen*. Canstatt: Emil Geiger, 1865.

Levy, P., *Moore: G. E. Moore and the Cambridge Apostles*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1980.

Lewis, C. I., *Mind and the World Order*. New York: Dover, 1929, 1956.

McCarthy, T., *The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1978.

McCumber, J., *Time in the Ditch: American Philosophy and the McCarthy Era*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2001.

McDowell, J., "Having the world in view: Sellars, Kant, and intentionality." *Journal of Philosophy* 95 (1998): 431–91.

—— *Mind and World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

—— "Two sorts of naturalism." In R. Hursthouse et al. (eds.) *Virtues and Reasons*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995, pp. 149–79.

Maddy, P., "Naturalism and the a priori." In P. Boghossian and C. Peacocke (eds.) *New Essays on the a priori*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 92—116.

Meinong, A., "The theory of objects," trans. R. Chisholm. In *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*, Glencoe, NJ: Free Press, 1960.

Monk, R., *Bertrand Russell*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1996.

—— *Ludwig Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1990.

Moore, G. E. "Analysis." In P. Schilpp (ed.) *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*, 2nd edn., New York: Tudor, 1952, pp. 660–7.

—— *Philosophical Studies*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1922.

—— *Principia Ethica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903.

—— "Review of Russell's *Essay on the Foundations of Geometry*." *Mind* 8 (1899): 397–405.

Moran, D., *Introduction to Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, 2000.

—— "Making sense: Husserl's phenomenology as transcendental idealism." In J. Malpas (ed.) *From Kant to Davidson: Philosophy and the Idea of the Transcendental*, London: Routledge, 2003, pp. 48–74.

Nagel, T., "What is it like to be a bat?" In *Mortal Questions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, pp. 165–80.

Neiman, S., *The Unity of Reason*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Nell, O. [= O'Neill, Onora], *Acting on Principle*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

O'Neill, O., *Constructions of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Oliver, A., "The metaphysics of properties." *Mind* 105 (1996): 1–80.

Pap, A., *Elements of Analytic Philosophy*, 2nd edn. New York: Hafner, 1972.

Papineau, D., *Philosophical Naturalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Passmore, J., "Logical positivism." In P. Edwards (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 5, New York: Macmillan, 1967, pp. 52–7.

Proust, J., *Questions of Form: Logic and the Analytic Proposition*, trans. A. Brenner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

Putnam, H., "Explanation and reference." In *Mind, Language, and Reality: Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975, pp. 196–214.

—— "Is semantics possible?" In *Mind, Language, and Reality: Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975, pp. 139–52.

—— *Mind, Language, and Reality: Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

—— "On properties." In *Mathematics, Matter, and Method: PhilosophicalPapers*, Vol. 1, 2nd edn., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, pp. 305–22.——-, *The Many Faces of Realism*. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1987.

—— "The meaning of 'meaning'." In *Mind, Language, and Reality: Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975, pp. 215–71.

—— "There is at least one a priori truth." In *Realism and Reason: Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, pp. 98–114.

Quine, W. V. O. "Epistemology naturalized." In *Ontological Relativity*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1969, pp. 69–90.

—— "Two dogmas of empiricism." In *From a Logical Point of View*, 2nd edn., New York: Harper & Row, 1961, pp. 20–46.

—— *Word and Object*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1960.

Rawls, J., "A Kantian conception of equality." *Cambridge Review* 96 (1975): 94–9.,

—— *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

—— "Kantian constructivism in moral theory." *Journal of Philosophy* 77 (1980): 515–72.

—— "Themes in Kant's moral philosophy." In E. Förster (ed.) *Kant's Transcendental Deductionsi*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1989, pp. 81–113.

Reichenbach, H., *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.

Richardson, A., *Carnap and the Construction of the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Ricketts, T., "Frege, the *Tractatus*, and the logocentric predicament." *Philosophers' Annual* 8 (1985): 247–59.

Rorty, R., *Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

—— (ed.) *The Linguistic Turn*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

—— *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Russell, B., *Autobiography*. London: Unwin, 1975.

—— *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 1993.

—— "Knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description." In *Mysticism and Logic*, Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1981, pp. 152–67.

—— *My Philosophical Development*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1959.

—— "The philosophy of logical atomism." In *Logic and Knowledge*, London: Unwin Hyman, 1956), pp. 177–281.

—— *Principles of Mathematics*, 2nd edn. New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.

—— *The Problems of Philosophy*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1995.

—— *Theory of Knowledge*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Ryle, G., "Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*." In M. Murray (ed.) *Heidegger and Modern Philosophy*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978, pp. 53–64.

Schilpp, P. (ed.) *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*, 2nd edn. New York: Tudor, 1952.

Schlick, M., *General Theory of Knowledge*, trans. A Blumberg. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1985.

—— "Is there a factual a priori?" In H. Feigl and W. Sellars (eds.) *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949, pp. 277–85.

Schopenhauer, A., *World as Will and Representation*, 2 vols., trans. E. F. J. Payne. New York: Open Court, 1969.

Sedgwick, S., "McDowell's Hegelianism." *European Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1997): 21–38.

Sellars, W., "Empiricism and the philosophy of mind." In *Science, Perception and Reality*, New York: Humanities Press, 1963, pp. 127–96.

—— "Philosophy and the scientific image of man." In *Science, Perception and Reality*, New York: Humanities Press, 1963, pp. 1–40.

—— *Science and Metaphysics: Variations on Kantian Themes*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.

—— *Science, Perception and Reality*. New York: Humanities Press, 1963.

Sluga, H., *Heidegger's Crisis: Philosophy and Politics in Nazi Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Smith, D. W., "Mind and body." In B. Smith and D. W. Smith (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Husserl*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 323–93.

Soames, S., *Philosophical Analysis in the Twentieth Century*, 2 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Spiegelberg, H. (with K. Schuhmann), *The Phenomenological Movement*, 3rd edn. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1994.

Strawson, P. F., *Analysis and Metaphysics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

—— *The Bounds of Sense*. London: Methuen, 1966.

—— *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*. London: Methuen, 1959.

—— *Introduction to Logical Theory*. London: Methuen, 1952.

—— *Logico-Linguistic Papers*. London: Methuen, 1971.

—— "Propositions, concepts, and logical truths." *Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1957): 15–25.

—— *Subject and Predicate in Logic and Grammar*. London: Methuen, 1974.

Stern, R. (ed.) *Transcendental Arguments: Problems and Prospects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

—— *Transcendental Arguments and Skepticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Stroud, B., "The charm of naturalism." *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 7 (1996): 43–55.

—— *The Significance of Philosophical Skepticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

—— "Transcendental arguments." *Journal of Philosophy* 65 (1968): 241–56.

Tugendhat, E., *Traditional and Analytical Philosophy*, trans. P. A. Gorner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Van Cleve, J., *Problems from Kant*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

von Wright, G. H., "Biographical sketch of Wittgenstein." In N. Malcolm, *Ludwig Wittgenstein: A Memoir, with a Biographical Sketch by G. H. von Wright*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Waismann, F., *Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle*, trans. J. Schulte and B. McGuinness. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.

Ward, J., "Psychology." In *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th edn., 29 vols. New York: Encyclopedia Britannica Co., 1911, vol. XXII, pp. 547–604.

Weatherston, M., *Heidegger's Interpretation of Kant*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Whitehead, A. N., *Process and Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929.

Whitehead, A. N. and B. Russell, *Principia Mathematica to *56*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Wilshire, B., *Fashionable Nihilism: A Critique of Analytic Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Wittgenstein, L., *Culture and Value*, trans. P. Winch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

—— *Notebooks 1914–1916*, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell, 1979.

—— "On Heidegger on being and dread." In M. Murray (ed.) *Heidegger and Modern Philosophy*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978, pp. 80–1.

—— *Philosophical Investigations*, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe. New York: Macmillan, 1953.

—— *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. C. K. Ogden. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Wood, A., *Kant's Ethical Thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Further reading

Beaney, M., (ed.) *The Analytic Turn*. London: Routledge, forthcoming. (A helpful collection of essays on the central topics of this chapter from a broadly analytic perspective).

Malpas, J., (ed.) *From Kant to Davidson: Philosophy and the Idea of the Transcendental*. London: Routledge, 2003. (A helpful collection of essays on the central topics of this chapter from a broadly Continental perspective).