

# Kantian Perspectives on Concepts

PHIL 285 – Winter 2008

Tuesdays, 2:00-4:50pm

Philosophy Seminar Room

## INSTRUCTORS

Clinton Tolley

Email: [ctolley@ucsd.edu](mailto:ctolley@ucsd.edu)

Phone: 822-2686

Office: HSS 8061

Hours: Thurs 2-4pm & by appt.

Eric Watkins

Email: [ewatkins@ucsd.edu](mailto:ewatkins@ucsd.edu)

Phone: 822-0082

Office: HSS 8018

Hours: Mon 10-11:30am & by appt.

## TEXTBOOKS

Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Guyer & Wood, trs. (Cambridge UP, 1998)

Kant, *Lectures on Logic*, J.M. Young, tr. (Cambridge UP, 1992)

Additional readings to be made available electronically through WebCT.

## COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course will be devoted to the analysis and evaluation of what the Kantian tradition has to say about the concept of a concept. Each meeting will begin by looking to how Kant himself addresses certain fundamental questions about the nature of concepts, and then move on to compare and contrast Kant's own position with the views of more recent philosophers writing from a broadly 'Kantian' perspective, including: Cassirer, Frege, Hintikka, Parsons, Friedman, Strawson, Cassam, Longuenesse, Sellars, McDowell, Brandom, and Ginsborg. A primary goal of the course will be to explore the extent to which Kant's account of concepts differs in its fundamentals from those of his predecessors as well as those of his successors.

## REQUIREMENTS

1. *Two 2-page responses to readings*: Each seminar participant will be required to select two readings, one from Kant's writings and another by a Kantian, each from different weeks, and then, by midnight Sunday prior to the relevant seminar meeting, to email a 2-page response to their chosen text to all seminar participants. This response should identify two or three main claims of the text, give a brief sketch of the main arguments intended to support these claims, and then raise two or three (critical or clarificatory) questions for discussion.

2. *One 1-page seminar paper proposal*: By the beginning of class in 8<sup>th</sup> week (Feb 26<sup>th</sup>), each seminar participant who is enrolled in the class will be required to send to both instructors a brief 1-page proposal for a final seminar paper. This proposal should identify the topic to be discussed, the main claim(s) to be pursued, and the primary texts to be engaged. (Though not required, participants are also warmly encouraged to meet with the instructors to discuss their proposals.)

3. *One 15-page seminar paper*: By the end of the Tuesday of exam week (March 18<sup>th</sup>), each seminar participant will be required to email a copy of their seminar paper to both instructors.

## SCHEDULE OF TOPICS AND READINGS

(subject to adjustment)

\* = recommended/background

### 1. Setting the context: ideas, the ‘workmanship of the understanding’, and *vérités de raison*

Port Royal *Logique*, Part I, 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 (‘genus’, ‘species’), 8, 9  
Locke, *Essay* III.1-3; IV.17.8  
Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais*, Preface; III.1 & 3; IV.17.8  
\**Logique*, Part I.3, 4, 7 (remainder)  
\*Locke, *Essay*, III.3.15-20  
\*Leibniz, *Essais*, I.1

### 2. Concepts in general: Kant between Leibniz and Frege

*Critique of Pure Reason* (henceforth ‘Critique’)  
Dialectic: ‘Stufenleiter’ (B376-77)  
Aesthetic: §1 (B33-36)  
Logic: Intro §I (B74-76)  
Analytic of Concepts: ‘Leitfaden’, 1<sup>st</sup> section (B91-94)  
Dialectic: The transcendental ideal (B599-601)  
*Lectures on Logic* (henceforth, ‘Logic’)  
Jäsche §§1-16; Intro §§V & VIII;  
Dohna-Wundlacken 701-4; 725-8; 752-6  
\*Blomberg §§10-14; §§115-123; §§249-291  
\*Vienna 904-13; 805-807; 834-40; 847-50;

Cassirer, *Substance and Function*, Part I, Ch. 1  
Frege, 1882 letter to Marty  
Frege, ‘Function and Concept’  
\*Frege, ‘Boole’s logical calculus and the Begriffsschrift’

### 3. Concepts, intuitions, and individuals

#### *Logic*

Jäsche §1 (review); §§17-21  
Dohna-Wundlacken 762-4  
Vienna 908-12 (review); 928-32  
Blomberg §§260-1; §301

#### *Critique*

Analytic: §9 (B95-6)  
Analytic: B-deduction, §19

Hintikka, 'On Kant's notion of intuition (Anschauung)'  
Thompson, 'Singular terms and intuitions in Kant's epistemology'  
Parsons, 'Kant's philosophy of arithmetic' & 'Postscript'  
\*Tolley, '*Umfang* as a technical term in Kant's logic'  
\*Friedman, 'Kant's Theory of Geometry'

### 4. Conceptual analysis, analytic judgments, and definitions

#### *Critique*

B-Introduction §§IV-V (B3-18)  
Analytic: Intro to Principles (B187-97)  
Doctrine of Method (B740-60)

#### *Logic*

Jäsche §VII; §§36-7; §§99-109  
Dohna-Wundlacken 718-24; 756-60; 767-9  
\*Vienna 822-829; 913-25; 936-37  
\*Blomberg §§266-84; §161; §139

L.W. Beck, 'Kant's theory of definition'  
L. Anderson, 'The Wolffian paradigm and its discontents'  
\*W. De Jong, 'Kant's analytic judgments'  
\*L.W. Beck, 'Can Kant's synthetic judgments be made analytic?'  
\*R. Hanna, 'Analyticity within the limits of cognition alone', *Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy*, Ch. 3, §§0-3  
\*L. Anderson, 'Is modus ponens analytic *sensu* Kant?'

### 5. Conceptual holism: the inferential and referential dimensions of concepts

#### *Critique*

Dialectic: On the transcendental ideas (B377-89)  
Dialectic: Transcendental ideal (B599-611; partly review)  
Appendix to the Dialectic: on the regulative use of Ideas (B678-696)

#### *Logic*

Jäsche §§10-11 (review); §§110-13  
Dohna-Wundlacken 760-62  
Vienna 925-28

Brandom, 'A Social Route from Reasoning to Representing', *Articulating Reasons*, Ch.5, §§I-II.1

Brandom, 'Some Pragmatist Themes in Hegel's Idealism', §§I-II

Fodor and Lepore, 'Brandom's Burdens'

\*Tolley, 'Determinacy and generality'

\*Brandom, *Making It Explicit*, Ch. 2, §§I-III

## 6. Pure concepts and the Metaphysical Deduction: logical forms, categories, schemata, Ideas

### *Critique*

Logic: Intro §§II-IV (B79-88)

Analytic of Concepts: 'Leitfaden' §§9-12 (B95-116)

Analytic of Concepts: Trans. Deduction, Intro (B124-28)

Analytic of Principles: Intro & Schematism (B169-B187)

Dialectic: Intro §II (B355-366)

Appendix to the Dialectic (B670-73)

### *Logic*

Jäsche §§3-6 (review)

Dohna-Wundlacken 752-3 (review)

Vienna 905-7 (review)

Strawson, *The Bounds of Sense*, pt. 2, II, §§1-4; pt. 4, §7

Cassam, 'A priori concepts'

## 7. Concept-formation and -application: concepts as rules for synthesis

### *Critique*

Analytic: Leitfaden §10 (B102-109)

Analytic: Transition to the Transcendental Deduction (A92-95)

A-Deduction (A95-130; with a focus on the 'threefold synthesis' (A98-110))

### *Logic*

Jäsche §§5-6 (review)

\**Prolegomena* §§17-22

Sellars, 'The role of the imagination in Kant's theory of experience'

Longuenesse, 'The three-fold synthesis and the mathematical model', *Kant and the capacity to judge* (KCJ), Ch. 2

\*Longuenesse, 'How discursive understanding comes to the sensible given', KCJ, Ch.5

## 8. The validity of pure concepts and the Transcendental Deduction

### *Critique*

B-Deduction §§19-21, §26

\*B-Deduction §§15-18; §§22-25; §27

Strawson, *The Bounds of Sense*, pt. 2, II, §§4-9

McDowell, 'Hegel's idealism as a radicalization of Kant'  
\*McDowell, *Mind and World* (MW), Lecture I, §§1-4; Lecture II, §9

## 9. Non-conceptual content I: sensation and objectivity

### *Critique*

(Review:) Aesthetic §I; Logic Intro §I; Leitfaden §10; B-Deduction §26 (esp. fn)

### *Logic*

Jäsche Intro §V (9:33; review)

Sellars, 'Sensibility and Understanding', *Science and Metaphysics*, Ch 1

McDowell, Woodbridge lecture II

Allais, 'Kant's account of non-conceptual content'

Ginsborg, 'Was Kant a non-conceptualist?'

Watkins, 'Kant and the myth of the given'

\*McDowell, MW, Lecture III & Postscript to III

\*McDowell, Woodbridge lecture I

## 10. Non-conceptual content II: aesthetic judgments (of taste, of the beautiful, of the sublime)

*Critique of Judgment* §1, §§6-8, §§15-16

### *Critique*

Aesthetic §1n; A28-30; B44-45

### *Logic*

(Review:) Jäsche §V; Dohna-Wundlacken 705-710; Blomberg §§18-34, §§98-99, §108, §§249-50; Vienna 805-13

David Bell, 'The Art of Judgment'

Ginsborg, 'Aesthetic Judgment and Perceptual Experience'

Karl Ameriks, 'New Views on Kant's Judgment of Taste'

\*Ameriks, 'Taste, Conceptuality, and Objectivity'