

6 Thought and being: Hegel's critique of Kant's theoretical philosophy

In Hegel's view, Kant made an indispensable contribution to the progress of philosophy by recognizing that the most basic principles of human thought reflect the structure of our own minds. But, like Moses who could see but not enter the Promised Land, he failed to grasp the ultimate truth, understood by Hegel himself, that the nature of our own thought and that of the reality to which Kant always contrasted it are in fact one and the same.¹ As he put it in the discussion of Kant in his *Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*,²

But after all, objectivity of thought, in Kant's sense, is again to a certain extent subjective. Thoughts, according to Kant, although universal and necessary categories, are *only our* thoughts – separated by an impassable gulf from the thing, as it exists apart from our knowledge. But the true objectivity of thinking means that the thoughts, far from being merely ours, must at the same time be the real essences of the things, and of whatever is an object to us. (*Encyclopedia*, §41Z, pp. 67–68).³

Hegel treats Kant's subjectivism, his insistence on an impassable gulf between thought and object, as mere dogma, indeed almost as a failure of nerve, and is confident that he can himself display knowledge of an absolute realm of being in which the merely apparently opposed poles of thought and object have the underlying identity that Kant failed to see.

Hegel does not engage in internal criticism in his response to Kant's theoretical philosophy: he does not proceed by demonstrating that Kant's own premises are unsound or that his conclusions do not follow validly from those premises. His arguments are external; he argues that Kant's conclusions fall short of his own philosophical expectations. In particular, Hegel does not examine Kant's own rea-

sons for his subjectivism, and thus neither shows why Kant's subjectivist scruples are invalid nor how his own view can transcend them. And thus Hegel apparently fails to see that it was no mere accident that Kant thought that the universal and necessary categories of our own thought were separated by an impassable gulf from reality itself, that he had instead argued that the universality and necessity of our thought could be gained *only* at the admittedly high cost of such a separation between thought and reality. Kant believed that any knowledge of universality and necessity had to be entirely *a priori*, or independent of experience, because, as Hume had taught, experience could deliver knowledge only of particular and contingent truths; but knowledge that is *a priori* could be knowledge only of the principles of our own thought and how things appear to us given those principles, not knowledge of how things really are in themselves. "For no determinations, whether absolute or relative, can be intuited prior to the existence of the things to which they belong, and none, therefore, can be intuited *a priori*" (*Critique of Pure Reason*, A 26/B 42);⁴ "For this reason also, while much can be said *a priori* about the form of appearances, nothing whatsoever can be asserted of the thing in itself, which may underlie these appearances" (A 49/B 66). Hegel's critique of Kant reflects a profoundly different philosophical sensibility than Kant's, and it is by no means obvious that his work should be taken to be addressing the same issues as Kant's and thus be judged by the same standards. Nevertheless, it would seem fair to require that a critic of Kant's subjectivism should have to explain how to justify claims to knowledge of necessary truth without accepting Kant's subjectivist explanation of the conditions of its possibility. At least within the confines of his explicit discussions of Kant, Hegel offers no such explanation.

Hegel does not restrict himself to the criticism of Kant's insistence on this gulf between thought and being; it is only one of a list of Kantian dualisms to which he objects. As he puts it in his earliest but most detailed critique of Kant:

The fundamental principle common to the philosophies of Kant, Jacobi, and Fichte is, then, the absoluteness of finitude and, resulting from it, the absolute antithesis of finitude and infinity, reality and ideality, the sensuous and the supersensuous, and the beyondness of what is truly real and absolute.

(*Faith and Knowledge*, p. 62)

In good part, however, the various charges of unnecessary dualism that Hegel brings against the central theses of Kant's theoretical (and for that matter his practical) philosophy ultimately depend on his underlying objection to Kant's basic separation of thought and being. In that case they are all threatened by Hegel's failure to address explicitly Kant's basic thesis that claims to knowledge of necessary truth can be justified only at the cost of a severe restriction of their scope to the human representation of reality rather than reality considered without any such restriction. Thus, throughout his critique of Kant's philosophy, there is the danger that Hegel simply wants to buy Kant's claims to *a priori* knowledge without paying the high cost that Kant thought had to be charged for them.

Yet it should not be concluded that Hegel's critique of Kant simply misses the point. Beneath their surface, where they often appear superficial and sometimes simply false, there is an underlying germ of truth motivating Hegel's objections to Kant – the belief that those very principles which Kant holds to be necessary truths are in some respects also radically contingent. But while this point certainly deserves emphasis, it cannot be thought of as an outright refutation of Kant, for Kant himself recognizes that the necessities of our thought are connected with irremediable contingencies as well. For Kant, however, this element of contingency represents the inevitable limits of human cognition; for Hegel, merely the at-best historically inevitable limitations of Kant's philosophy.

I. KANT'S THEORETICAL PHILOSOPHY

To understand Hegel's critique of Kant, it is necessary to understand the main claims of Kant's own philosophy. The following outline will suffice for present purposes.

Kant divided his main exposition of his theoretical philosophy, the *Critique of Pure Reason* (first published in 1781, extensively revised in 1787), into two major divisions, a "Doctrine of Elements" and a "Doctrine of Method". He divided the former into a "Transcendental Aesthetic" and "Transcendental Logic," and the "Transcendental Logic" in turn into a "Transcendental Analytic" and "Transcendental Dialectic." The division between "Aesthetic" and "Logic" reflected his fundamental premise that all knowledge requires both

the presentation of a particular subject-matter, through a singular representation or what he called an intuition (*Anschauung*), on the one hand, and the subsumption of this particular subject-matter under a general concept (*Begriff*) by means of a judgment (*Urteil*) on the other. The division between "Analytic" and "Dialectic" reflected Kant's distinction between the genuinely informative application of concepts constructed by the faculty of human understanding to intuitions furnished by the faculty of human sensibility, on the one hand, and the vain attempt on the other hand to construct knowledge out of ideas supplied by the faculty of reason alone, without any limitation by the possibilities of human sensibility. Although Kant did recognize that there was a legitimate "logical" rather than "real" use of the faculty of reason to regiment judgments about intuitions made by the understanding, he argued that such logical regimentation of judgments was not itself knowledge of objects, and that any attempt to derive knowledge of objects, in particular the unconditional absolutes of traditional metaphysics, through ideas of reason alone would be natural but fallacious.

Each of these two main divisions, that between "Aesthetic" and "Logic," or intuition and concept, and that between "Analytic" and "Dialectic," or the legitimate use of understanding and the attempted but fallacious real use of reason, was motivated by a fundamental philosophical insight. Kant thought that a conflation between the separate roles of intuition and concept must lead to Leibniz's completely unjustifiable principle of the identity of indiscernibles, which asserts that what would otherwise be thought to be two distinct objects must in fact be numerically identical whenever their concepts are qualitatively indiscernible, and to the fanciful metaphysics of the monadology which was grounded upon this principle. And he held that the failure to distinguish properly between understanding and reason lay behind the traditional metaphysical assumption that the faculty of reason serves not merely to structure knowledge-claims produced by the cooperation of sensibility and understanding, our capacities to receive inputs about particular objects and subsume them under concepts, but also to provide unconditional knowledge of absolutes such as the soul, the cosmos as a whole, and God, which would be independent of any confirmation by sensory evidence and exceed all the limits of our sensibility. Kant's division of his *Critique* thus reflected his division of our cognitive faculties, and his division

of cognitive faculties was in turn required, as he saw it, to avoid some of the most pervasive errors of traditional metaphysics.

Kant's general division of the cognitive faculties thus reflects the main point of his critique of traditional metaphysics. Within his treatment of the several faculties, further distinctions are drawn that allow for his positive doctrine of synthetic *a priori* knowledge, that is, his explanation of the possibility of knowledge of propositions that are universal and necessary, and which must therefore be known independent of any particular experience, yet are genuinely informative or synthetic rather than merely definitional or analytic. First, Kant distinguishes between empirical and pure intuition, or the presentation of particular objects through sensory stimuli and the form in which such empirical intuition takes place. Kant argues that there are two pure forms of intuition through which all particulars are presented, namely space and time, and that the basic structure of space and time, as well as the mathematics that reflects this basic structure, particularly geometry as reflecting the structure of space, can be known *a priori*. But the only way in which these basic structures can be known independent of experience, he argues, is if they reflect the structure of our own capacity for sensibility, through which objects appear to us. In this case, space and time must be subjective forms of intuition, although it seems possible that they could at the same time also be forms inherent in the independent objects that we perceive. Kant further argues that if our claims about spatiality and temporality are to be *necessarily* true of *all* the objects of which they hold, then they cannot be true at all of things as they are in themselves, for we could never have grounds for supposing them to be anything more than *contingently* true of things existing independent of our necessarily spatial or temporal representations of them. Therefore, space and time are necessary features of all appearances of objects to us, but are true only of the appearances of those objects, not of the things as they may be in themselves (see especially A 47–8/V 65–6).⁵ (Later, in the Transcendental Dialectic, Kant also argues that space and time must be regarded as features only of appearances but not of things in themselves, because otherwise we will be committed to incompatible but equally valid arguments that space and time are both finite and infinite in maximal and minimal extension, which is clearly impossible. See the Antinomy of Pure Reason, especially A 426–36/B 454–65).

Next, Kant argues that although empirical concepts of objects must always be based on empirical intuitions, we can have *a priori* knowledge of a set of pure categories of the understanding that determine the structure of empirical concepts just as the pure forms of intuition determine the structure of empirical intuitions. Kant begins by noting that any claim to knowledge is cast in the form of a judgment, and that the logical structure of all judgments can be characterized by means of a determinate set of functions. Specifically, all judgments possess logical quantity (they predicate a property of one, some, or all objects in a domain), quality (they affirm or deny a predicate of the subject),⁶ relation (they connect a predicate to a subject, an antecedent to a consequent, or several disjunctive alternatives to each other), and a modality (they are possibly, actually, or necessarily true or false, as the case may be) (A 70/B 95). Then Kant argues that *objects* must be conceptualized in such a way that *judgments* that are characterized in these terms can be asserted of them – thus, certain pure concepts of the understanding, commonly called the categories, must provide the form for all empirical concepts of the understanding so that judgments employing these logical functions can be asserted of objects of knowledge (see especially A 79/B104–5). The categories are thus known *a priori* as the conditions of the possible conceptualization of all objects.

Kant then attempts to connect this doctrine of categories with a conception of self-consciousness or “apperception” by means of an argument the purport of which is as obscure as it is important, the “Transcendental Deduction” of the categories.⁷ Here Kant tries to argue that the possibility of self-consciousness itself implies the use of judgment and therefore the possibility of knowledge of objects by means of the categories, and further that there is a unity among all the representations comprising one’s self-consciousness that can be grounded only by means of judgments connecting them all as representations of a coherent realm of objects. Indeed, he goes so far as to suggest that the unity of objects in a coherent space and time is not given by the pure forms of intuition alone, but depends on the possibility of objectively valid judgments about objects in space and time structured by means of the categories (see B 160–61n.). Kant expands upon this hint in the discussion of the “System of the Principles of Pure Understanding,” which follows the “Transcendental Deduction.” Here he argues that certain principles applying the categories

to spatio-temporal intuitions – the principles that all objects may be measured by means of extensive and intensive quantities, and then, most important, the principles of the conservation of substance and the universal validity of causation and interaction, which are central to his philosophical defense of Newtonian physics against the metaphysical and epistemological objections of Leibniz from one side and Hume from the other – are necessary conditions for the representation of a unitary and determinate realm of relationships among such intuitions understood as representations of both external objects and the states of one's own experience.

In the ensuing "Transcendental Dialectic," however, Kant argues that although it is natural for us to try to represent the traditional metaphysical absolutes of soul, (the absolutely simple), world (the absolutely all-inclusive), and God (the absolute necessary), by means of ideas of pure reason formed in analogy to the pure concepts of the understanding, especially the categories of relation (substance, causation, and interaction), we have no theoretical justification for so doing. We always need empirical intuitions given by sensibility to give content to the use of the categories, and empirical intuitions are given in a spatio-temporal framework that is unitary and determinate but indefinitely extendable. There can therefore never be completeness or closure in the use of the categories, although we can formulate the idea of completeness in their use, or in the use of reason to regiment empirical concepts formed in accordance with the categories into a classificatory and explanatory hierarchy. Thus Kant argues that the ideas of reason have a legitimate *regulative* but not *constitutive* employment – they properly describe our cognitive ambitions as well as presuppositions, but cannot be taken by themselves to furnish absolute knowledge of metaphysical reality (see A 642–704/B 670–732).⁸

In conclusion, then, Kant's position is that we can explain how we have *a priori* knowledge of the structure of appearance only by denying that we have knowledge of the ultimate nature of reality by means of sensibility, understanding, or pure reason. The pure forms of intuition provide knowledge of appearances, not things as they are in themselves, because they can be known to be necessarily true of appearances only by being denied to be true of things as they are in themselves at all. The pure concepts of understanding and the ideas of pure reason are not in themselves unfit for the *conception* of

things as they are in themselves; on the contrary, they may be cogently used to *think* of such objects. But since both categories and ideas of reason yield *knowledge* only when applied to intuitions, and intuitions are restricted to the appearance rather than reality of things, the categories of the understanding and ideas of reason also provide actual knowledge only of appearances. In fact, Kant supposes that it is not only possible but necessary for us to use both the categories and ideas of reason to form concepts of things in themselves as contrasted to appearances, especially to form the concept of the freedom of things in themselves as contrasted to the determinism that reigns in the realm of appearances (see especially the third Antinomy, A 444–51/B 472–79); but as knowledge-claims always require instantiation in intuition, such speculations, even if necessary, do not amount to knowledge.

II. HEGEL'S CRITIQUE: THE UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS

In several places, not only the works already mentioned but also his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Hegel offers an exposition of the several branches of Kant's philosophy and point-by-point criticism of it.⁹ Here we consider only some of the most important of Hegel's objections to Kant's theoretical philosophy. In general, Hegel objected to what he identified as both the subjectivism and the formalism of Kant's philosophy: "Because the essence of the Kantian philosophy consists in its being critical idealism, it plainly confesses that its principle is subjectivism and formal thinking"; thus, "It makes the identity of opposites into the absolute terminus of philosophy, the pure boundary which is nothing but the negation of philosophy" (*Faith and Knowledge*, p. 67). The opposition that Hegel objects to under the rubric of "subjectivism" is Kant's contrast between appearances and things in themselves, his claim that although we can and indeed must be able to coherently *think* of things in themselves, we can have both *a priori* and empirical *knowledge* only of appearances. The opposition that Hegel objects to under the rubric of "formal thinking" is Kant's insistence that, whether in the case of the pure intuitions of sensibility or the pure concepts of the understanding, we can have *a priori* knowledge only of the pure *forms* of representation, the abstract structures of intuition, judg-

ment, and reasoning, and must always wait upon experience for completion of the knowledge of particulars – which is for that reason never entirely *a priori*. As we have seen, Kant thought that both of these contrasts, that between appearance and reality and that between the abstract form of knowledge and its particular matter, were necessary conditions for the explanation of the possibility of any *a priori* knowledge of universal and necessary truth at all. Hegel thought that these restrictions could be overcome.

Hegel's official position is that previous philosophical systems were incomplete but historically necessary stages in the self-expression of "spirit" or the intellectual core of reality. In the case of Kant, however, his comments suggest personal disappointment at a missed opportunity. Hegel seems to have been particularly disappointed with the dualisms of formalism and subjectivism in Kant's philosophy, because he thought that Kant had come very close to realizing the essential identity of thought and being at both the beginning and the end of his theoretical system – at the beginning in his conceptions of judgment and apperception, which are supposed to provide the foundations for much that follows, and at the end, in the idea of an intuitive intellect that Kant used to give graphic expression to the ideal of a completed empirical knowledge based on *a priori* foundations. The discussion of Hegel's critique of Kant should thus begin with his treatment of Kant's conceptions of judgment and apperception. In both cases, one may well conclude that Hegel read his own very different philosophical assumptions into Kant's system from the start, and thus ensured that his criticism could only be external rather than internal to Kant's own project.

Hegel's crucial reinterpretations of these fundamental Kantian concepts are evident in *Faith and Knowledge*, although they later disappear from view. Hegel forces Kant's conception of judgment into his own philosophical vision by interpreting the connection between subject and predicate as that between being and thought: "These heterogeneous elements, the subject which is the particular and in the form of being, and the predicate which is the universal and in the form of thought, are at the same time absolutely identical." Given this interpretation, Hegel thinks that Kant should have been led by the concept of judgment directly to his own conception of all rationality as the recognition of the fundamental identity of

being and thought: "It is Reason alone that is the possibility of this positing [of identity in judgment], for Reason is nothing else but the identity of heterogeneous elements of this kind" (*Faith and Knowledge*, p. 69). In Hegel's view, in every judgment we get at least a partial glimpse of the fundamental identity between the structure of our thought and the structure of reality itself, and the function of the totality of our judgments is nothing less than to provide absolute knowledge of this identity, which is the culmination of philosophy itself. He therefore finds Kant's subjectivism and formalism to be a retreat from an insight that Kant himself reached in his own most basic conception of judgment.

Hegel's understanding of Kant's conception of judgment, however, is by no means Kant's own. First, note that Hegel offers "the Idea that subject and predicate of the synthetic judgment are identical in the *a priori* way" as Kant's answer to the question "How are synthetic judgments *a priori* possible?" (*loc. cit.*); but Kant does not explain the possibility of *synthetic a priori* judgments by means of identity – that is his explanation of *analytic* judgments. Analytic judgments give expression to a whole or partial identity between the concepts serving as subject and predicate; they can therefore be known to be true solely on the basis of the logical law that all identity statements are true, and for that reason are always *a priori*. Synthetic judgments are precisely those in which the predicate *adds* information to that conveyed by the concept of the subject, and therefore cannot be known to be true by means of merely logical principles about identity – that is why it is a problem how a judgment can be synthetic yet known *a priori*. Instead, Kant's account is that subject and predicate in synthetic *a priori* judgments are connected in virtue of the inherent structure of our capacities for intuition and judgment, and can be known *a priori* because of our *a priori* knowledge of these structures in spite of the absence of identity between subject and predicate concepts.

Second and even more important, Hegel's equation of a judgment's predication of a universal of a particular with the identity between thought and being is a far from obvious interpretation of Kant's own intention. Kant's account of judgment is far from clear,¹⁰ but his basic idea seems to be that all judgments are composed of concepts, which are inherently general, yet ultimately relate to intuitions, which are representations of particulars (see A 19/B 33). Some

judgments predicate one general concept of another concept that is also functioning in a general way, as in "All bachelors are males"; others predicate a general characteristic of a particular object not by incorporating an intuition directly into the judgment itself, but rather by using a general subject-concept to refer to a particular object in a certain context, as in a judgment like "This male is a bachelor." Here it is not the concept "male" by itself that succeeds in referring to a particular subject for the judgment, but rather the conjunction of the concept "male" with the indexical term "this" employed in an appropriate spatio-temporal context where both speaker and hearer understand which male is the object of reference. So on Kant's account, particular objects are always brought into judgments through a complex relationship between general concepts and the forms of intuition, and there is no question of any direct presence of real being in the judgment itself. Moreover, even if we were to ignore the contextual use of a general concept to refer to an object of intuition in Kant's conception of the subject of a judgment, and were to interpret Kant as supposing that intuitions themselves entered directly into judgments, Hegel's interpretation would still be problematic. For the Kantian intuition is not itself a particular real object outside the realm of thought, but rather a singular *representation* of an object. It may thus be contrasted to a concept in the particular Kantian sense of a universal, but in terms of the more-general contrast between thought and being, intuitions certainly remain on the side of thought. Indeed, as we saw, it is the most-basic claim of Kant's theory of knowledge that intuitions give us access to the appearances of things, not to those things as they are in themselves; so as long as judgments connect concepts to intuitions, whether indirectly or directly, it is difficult to see how they could be thought to express an identity between thought and being. For Kant, judgments are the fundamental structures of thought itself, although perhaps not purely *conceptual* thought. Hegel's interpretation of the relation between subject and predicate as that between being and thought reflects his own assumptions, not Kant's.

Something similar seems to occur in Hegel's interpretation of Kant's conception of the transcendental unity of apperception. For Kant, this kind of unity, like the unity of a judgment, remains within the realm of thought. Kant's idea of transcendental apperception is the idea of a synthesis or combination of all of my *representations* in

a way that allows me to recognize that in spite of their diversity of content, they are all representations belonging to a single self that may say "I think" of each and all of them (see B 132–33). Kant tries to argue that it is necessary to interpret the representations comprised in such a unified set as representations of objects which are therefore governed by the categories as rules for conceiving of objects (B 137, 139); but this does not change the fact that the unity of apperception is itself a unity *among one's representations*. Hegel, however, interprets the concept of apperception differently, understanding it as a primordial recognition of unity out of which the more-limited conceptions of self and object are abstracted, but of course in such a way that they can ultimately be rejoined to make explicit the knowledge of the underlying identity of thought and being. Thus he writes:

In Kant the synthetic unity is undeniably the absolute and original identity of self-consciousness, which of itself posits the judgment absolutely and *a priori*. Or rather, as identity of subjective and objective, the original identity appears in consciousness as judgment. This original unity of apperception is called synthetic precisely because of its two-sidedness, the opposites being absolutely one in it. The absolute synthesis is absolute insofar as it is not an aggregate of manifolds which are first picked up, and then the synthesis supervenes upon them afterwards. . . . The true synthetic unity or rational identity is just that identity which is the connecting of the manifold with the empty identity, the Ego. It is from this connection, as original synthesis that the Ego as thinking subject, and the manifold as body and world first detach themselves. (*Faith and Knowledge*, p. 72)

As he puts it on the next page, the unity of apperception is the "absolute identity of the heterogeneous." Hegel thus interprets the unity of apperception along the lines of what later came to be known as neutral monism.¹¹ Self or thought and object or being are not ultimately different but are represented as different by abstractions that it is the end of philosophy to overcome, thereby restoring the original recognition of unity implicit in apperception itself.

This is very far from Kant's own understanding of apperception. For Kant, again, the unity of apperception is a synthetic unity among one's own representations. The task of empirical judgment may be conceived of as that of placing a dual interpretation on these representations, using the forms of judgment to interpret them as both representations of the successive states in the history of the self and

representations of the successive states in the history of the world of objects external to the self; but there is no hint of any identity between the self and its objects themselves. For Kant, apperception, like judgment, remains confined within the sphere of thought. It may require us to represent a unified world of objects, but it is by no means identical with such a world.

Hegel does not argue for his interpretation of these two basic concepts of Kant. The interpretation of Kant by intervening writers, especially Fichte, would no doubt contribute to an historical explanation of Hegel's reading of Kant. But from a purely philosophical point of view, Hegel is clearly reading his own profoundly different, one might almost say incommensurable, philosophical presuppositions into key points in Kant, points that Kant perhaps left undefended by stressing their centrality yet himself explaining only obscurely, but which would not have invited Hegel's interpretation of them except from someone already predisposed to Hegel's assumptions. But having read Kant's conceptions as pointing the way toward his own recognition of the identity between thought and being, Hegel could not conceal his disappointment that Kant refused to build upon it.

III. HEGEL'S CRITIQUE: THE BILL OF PARTICULARS

We can now turn to the details of Hegel's explicit criticisms of Kant. These criticisms can be classified under four headings.

(i) First, there are what we might think of as methodological objections to Kant's philosophy. Two of these are prominent. One is the charge that there is something incoherent about what Hegel takes to be Kant's proposal to scrutinize the faculties of knowledge before attempting to obtain knowledge itself. This project sounds plausible, Hegel says, for "Knowledge is thereby represented as an instrument," and it seems natural enough to suppose that we can examine an instrument before using it. In fact, he believes, it is as implausible as refusing to go into the water until one knows how to swim: you cannot learn to swim except in the water, nor can you determine limits on knowledge from some standpoint prior to knowledge (*Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, III, p. 428; *Encyclopedia*, §412; p. 66). On the contrary, Hegel claims, "The forms of thought must be studied in their essential nature and complete de-

velopment: they are at once the object of research and the action of that object. Hence they examine themselves: in their own action they must determine their limits, and point out their defects" (*Encyclopedia, loc. cit.*). This self-examination of forms of thought rather than external and antecedent scrutiny of cognitive capacities is what Hegel proposes to supply under the rubric of dialectic, which for him means not the external criticism of fallacious metaphysical theories, as in Kant, but rather the internal process of self-correcting development in both concepts and reality, which is reflected in philosophical theories whose incompleteness (prior to his own) is never a matter of mere fallacy but rather reflects the stages in the evolution of concepts and reality themselves.

Hegel's second methodological charge is that for all of Kant's differences with the empiricist school of Hume and his predecessors, there is something essentially empirical about Kant's method. According to Hegel, both Kant's enumeration of our cognitive capacities or "factors of consciousness" in general – thus, his tripartite distinction between sensibility, understanding, and reason – as well as his list of the twelve categories in particular are arrived at by merely empirical, historical, or psychological means. Hegel made this charge repeatedly over the years. In *Faith and Knowledge*: "Kant has simply no ground but experience and empirical psychology for holding that the human cognitive faculty essentially consists in the way it appears" (p. 89). In the *Encyclopedia*: "A further deficiency in the system is that it gives only a historical description of thought, and a mere enumeration of the factors of consciousness. The enumeration is in the main correct: but not a word touches upon the necessity of what is thus empirically colligated" (§60z; p. 94). And in his lectures: Kant "sets to work in a psychological manner, i.e., historically, inasmuch as he describes the main stages in theoretic consciousness" (*Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, III, pp. 432–33). Further, the same kind of claim is made more specifically about Kant's table of categories. Hegel claims that "Kant did not put himself to much trouble in discovering the categories" (*Encyclopedia*, §42, p. 68), and that "Kant thus accepts the categories in an empiric way, without thinking or developing of necessity these differences from unity" (*Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, III, p. 439). Indeed, in the latter place Hegel makes the same claim of merely empirical method about Kant's assertion of the

unique status of space and time as forms of intuition: "Just as little did Kant attempt to deduce time and space, for he accepted them likewise from experience – a quite unphilosophical and unjustifiable procedure."

On their face, Hegel's methodological criticisms of Kant seem grossly unfair. His claim that Kant's attempt to scrutinize our cognitive capacities prior to actually using them is like trying to learn how to swim without actually getting into the water suggests that Kant supposes that we can somehow directly examine our cognitive faculties, perhaps by some form of introspection, as indeed Locke, with whom Hegel closely links Kant on this point, seems to have thought (see *Faith and Knowledge*, pp. 68–69). But although Kant does once suggest that the character of pure as contrasted to empirical intuition may be discovered by a Lockean process of abstraction (A 22/B 36), he does not suggest that the general distinction among sensibility, understanding, and reason, nor his claims about the transcendental rather than empirical principles and applications of these faculties, are reached by anything like an empirical, psychological method. Kant's fundamental distinction between sensibility and understanding, and between those two faculties and the further faculty of reason, are clearly, even if indirectly, argued for as necessary in order to avoid the major errors of previous metaphysics, both rationalist and empiricist. A serious criticism of Kant's distinction between sensibility and understanding, for instance, would therefore have to show that this distinction is not required in order to avoid the confusions of Leibnizian philosophy.

Nor does Kant attempt to describe the structure and operations of his cognitive faculties, especially at the transcendental level, that is, the level of necessary preconditions of knowledge, in abstraction from all application of these faculties. On the contrary, in many instances, at least in the case of what he calls his analytical or regressive method,¹² Kant makes inferences to the nature of our cognitive capacities as the only possible explanation of claims to *a priori* knowledge which he takes to be indubitable, whether these be specific, as in the case of our alleged *a priori* knowledge of geometry, or general, as in the case of our alleged *a priori* knowledge of the numerical unity of the self (see A 114). One might well object that these claims to *a priori* knowledge, which are the basis for inferences about the nature of our cognitive capacities, are themselves

inadequately defended; but that is not the same as objecting, as Hegel does, that Kant tries to examine our cognitive capacities in complete abstraction from any actual knowledge-claims. In most cases, Kant's procedure is to begin with certain apparently indisputable claims to knowledge, make inferences to the cognitive capacities necessary to explain such claims, and only then make further determinations about the inevitable limitations of such cognitive capacities. This is not the same as examining an instrument before using it.¹³

Hegel's charge that Kant's list of categories is merely empirically derived is also peculiar. It is ironic that this is the same charge that Kant had brought against Aristotle's list of categories (A 81/B 107). Kant himself thought that his list of categories was systematically developed from the insight that all knowledge-claims must take the form of judgments and a rigorous logical analysis of the several aspects and therefore possible forms of judgment. To be sure, he may not have made the method of his logical derivation of the several aspects and forms of judgment terribly clear,¹⁴ but there can be no doubt that Kant intended his derivation of the categories to proceed by entirely *a priori* means from the underlying insight into the judgmental nature of knowledge or even consciousness itself.

Hegel refers to Kant's link between the categories and the judgmental nature of thought once (*Encyclopedia*, §42, p. 68) but seems to find it unconvincing. Why? Part of the answer may be Kant's own fault. For all of his programmatic statements about the erroneous methods of previous philosophy, Kant was not very explicit about the nature of his own methods, and he sometimes made his most basic premises seem more mysterious than they actually are. One passage that might certainly have seemed objectionable to Hegel suggests that the origin of the list of categories as well as that of the forms of intuition is ultimately a mystery:

This peculiarity of our understanding, that it can produce *a priori* unity of apperception solely by means of the categories, and only by such and so many, is as little capable of further explanation as why we have just these and no other functions of judgment, or why space and time are the only forms of our possible intuition. (B 145–6)

But this mystification is at least partially unnecessary. Although Kant may have had no further explanation to offer of the fact that we

represent distinct external objects and their states as simultaneous and successive through the use of space and time, he did have a perfectly good explanation of why we use only "such and so many" categories: All thought takes the form of judgment, and the possible logical forms of judgment admit of an exhaustive analysis precisely in terms of his quite compact list of categories.¹⁵ Moreover, Kant sometimes suggested that the categorical structure of judgment, or discursive thought, is by no means a peculiarity of human cognition in particular, but necessary for any form of judgment at all. Precisely for this reason Kant could argue that the categories, unlike space and time, could be used at least to *conceive* of things in themselves even if not to acquire actual *knowledge* of them.

A reader sufficiently impressed by Kant's connection of the categories to the fundamentally judgmental nature of thought would not be overly concerned with Kant's own mystification in the passage just cited. Why doesn't Hegel see past it? He believes that not Kant but only Fichte saw the "need of exhibiting the *necessity* of these categories and giving a genuine *deduction* of them," although no one before himself was capable of getting past "the classification of notions, judgments, and syllogisms . . . taken merely from observation and so only empirically treated" and instead deducing the forms of thought "from thought itself" (*Encyclopedia*, §42, p. 69). But why doesn't Kant's derivation of the list of categories from the essentially judgmental or discursive nature of thought itself fulfill Hegel's requirement of a deduction "from thought itself"? Part of the answer here would seem to be that Kant appeals to two premises, to the discursive nature of thought and to a separate logical analysis of the possible structures of judgment, whereas Hegel seems to suppose that genuine philosophy requires dialectical advance from a single premise, or not just from "thought itself" but from some *single* thought. This is a view entertained by some of Kant's predecessors, such as the middle-period Leibniz,¹⁶ and revived by some of Kant's immediate successors, such as K.L. Reinhold and Fichte, but decidedly rejected by Kant himself, beginning with his 1762 prize essay *Enquiry into the Clarity of the Principles of Natural Theology and Ethics* and continuing throughout his life. On the assumptions that Hegel accepted from his immediate predecessors, only a derivation of all the categories from some single concept could justify a claim to necessity; Kant's conjunction of principles for the derivation of

the categories must for that reason alone have seemed to him to doom Kant's categories to contingency.

(ii) Pervading Hegel's comments about Kant, and in the *Encyclopedia* directly linked to his complaint about Kant's merely empirical discovery of the categories, is his criticism that Kant unnecessarily takes the inherent forms of thought to be *no more than* forms of thought, not forms of real being as well. In the *Encyclopedia's* opening comments on Kant's theoretical philosophy, Hegel makes it sound as if it is just one of Kant's quirks that he regards the categories as merely subjective: "To regard the categories as subjective only, i.e. as a part of ourselves, must seem very odd to the natural mind: and no doubt there is something queer about it." Hegel concedes that Kant is quite right not to try to find the categories in mere sensation, or to simply conflate thought and sensation – this was Hume's mistake, for instance, in looking for an *impression* of necessary connection – but wrong to think that because the categories must be added to sensation by thought, they are therefore merely valid for our own representation of the world, and not descriptive of genuine reality as well. Thus he continues:

Still, though the categories, such as unity, or cause and effect, are strictly the property of thought, it by no means follows that they must be ours merely and not also characteristics of the objects. Kant however confines them to the subject-mind, and his philosophy may be styled subjective idealism: for he holds that both the form and the matter of knowledge are supplied by the Ego – or knowing subject – the form by our intellectual, the matter by our sentient ego. (*Encyclopedia*, §42z, p. 70)

Hegel goes on to say that not a "word need be wasted" on the "content of this subjective idealism." In the immediate context, what he seems to mean is that it can be ignored because it does not really affect the content of our description of the proper conceptualization of objects, which remains the same whether we take it to be merely subjective or to characterize how objects really are. But at another level, he also seems to mean that Kant's doctrine is beneath contempt, so obviously false as not to need any detailed refutation. He just seems to assume that the real nature of thought and being are identical, thus that if one had discovered the genuine structure of thought in the guise of the categories (and he believes that Kant's own list of the categories falls far short of doing this),

then one would also have discovered the genuine structure of reality as well.

In this criticism Hegel takes no notice of Kant's special connection between transcendental idealism and the forms of intuition, that is, his argument that the categories do not furnish us with knowledge of reality not because of any defect of their own, but because they always require application to sensible intuitions, which however are given in forms – space and time – that cannot be forms of things in themselves as well. In other words, Kant does not argue that there is any reason why the categories themselves should not be fit to represent the structure of reality; it is space and time which are not fit to do so. We must apply the categories to the intuitions we have, and thus in the only application of them that is available to us, they do not give knowledge of external reality as it is in itself (see especially B 158). But in fact Kant always assumes that the categories “constitute the thought of an *object in general*,” and transcendental idealism applies to the categories only because of the transcendental idealism of the forms of intuition to which they must be applied in order to yield actual knowledge as opposed to mere thought.

In some places Hegel does recognize that it is not because of any defect in his conception of the categories themselves, but rather because of his requirement of their application to empirical intuitions that Kant includes them in the scope of his transcendental idealism. Thus in the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, he states that:

The knowing subject does not with Kant really arrive at reason, for it remains still the individual self-consciousness as such, which is opposed to the universal. As a matter of fact there is described in what we have seen only the empirical finite self-consciousness which requires a material from the outside, or which is limited. We do not ask whether these facts of knowledge are in and for themselves true or untrue; the whole of knowledge remains within subjectivity, and on the other side there is the thing-in-itself as an external. (*Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, III, p. 443)

Here Hegel suggests that the problem with the categories is that they are merely empty forms of thought that need to be filled, but that when they are filled with “material from the outside,” they will be filled with empirical data that cannot reveal things in themselves.

In order to combat Kant's transcendental, or, as he calls it, subjective idealism, Hegel would therefore have to criticize Kant's argument for the transcendental idealism of space and time, not just appeal to an alleged identity between thought and being. Although he obviously objects to Kant's theory of the transcendental ideality of space and time, Hegel does not actually explain what he thinks is wrong with Kant's argument that knowledge of necessity presupposes subjectivity. Thus even when he recognizes that Kant does not insist on the subjectivity of the categories per se but only on the subjectivity of their application to empirical intuitions, Hegel still does not explain what he thinks Kant's error actually is.

One problem that he does have in mind is that on Kant's account the material to which the categories must be applied is "from the outside" or "external" to the categories; that is, the categories do not produce their own applications from within themselves but rather are dependent on material for which they are not themselves responsible. In this sense it may be said that it is contingent that the particular categories we must employ do apply to the particular empirical intuitions to which we do apply them. Since in many places Hegel makes this an independent point, stressing not the subjectivity of the categories on Kant's account but rather a contingency that infects their application, we may treat this as a separate objection.

(iii) This criticism of Kant is linked to Hegel's objection that Kant's philosophy is "formal thinking." This is the charge that Kant confines necessity to the level of general forms or concepts, and thus leaves the application of such general structures to determinate particulars contingent. Hegel frequently expresses his point by objecting to Kant's distinction between intuition and conceptualization, but what he objects to is not just the distinction between the pure categories and pure forms of intuition but also that between the categories of thought and the particular objects of experience furnished by sensation, that is, empirical intuition. Thus at least a key part of his objection is a complaint about the contingency of the application of the categories to any particular empirical data. That is, he objects to the fact that although our use of just "such and so many" categories might be necessary in itself – although as we have just seen he does not really think Kant is entitled even to that claim – there is no necessity that our categories apply to just these

and no other particulars given by sensation; thus, in the last analysis, that these categories apply to just these particular empirical intuitions is something that Kant leaves quite contingent.

In *Faith and Knowledge*, Hegel connects this point to the previous criticism about the gap between the categories and things in themselves, arguing that in Kant's scheme, the origin of sensations must be left to the action of things in themselves on our sensibility, but that precisely because we cannot cognize things in themselves, the origin of sensations is therefore incomprehensible to us:

Identity of this formal kind [that is, of the forms of thought] finds itself immediately confronted by or next to an infinite non-identity, with which it must coalesce in some incomprehensible way. On one side there is the Ego, with its productive imagination or rather with its synthetic unity which, taken thus in isolation, is formal unity of the manifold. But next to it there is an infinity of sensations and, if you like, of things in themselves. Once it is abandoned by the categories, this realm cannot be anything but a formless lump . . . In this way, then, the objectivity of the categories in experience and the necessity of these relations become once more something contingent and subjective. . . . A formal idealism which in this way sets an absolute Ego-point and its intellect on one side, and an absolute manifold, or sensation, on the other side, is a dualism.

(*Faith and Knowledge*, pp. 76–78)

Kant conceives of the categories, necessitated by the structure of our own understanding, as being externally applied to whatever sensations happen to present themselves to us, which originate in things in themselves over which the structure of our own intellects exercises no influence whatever. These sensations are thus a formless lump, to which our own forms are externally applied, but apparently it remains contingent that we can succeed in so doing – it is certainly not necessitated by anything in the source of the sensations themselves.

In the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Hegel does not express this objection by reference to things in themselves, but rather through a comment upon Kant's doctrine of schematism, that is, his view that the purely logical content of the categories has to be re-interpreted in sensible terms before the categories can be applied to particular empirical intuitions.¹⁷ Here he says:

The connection of these two is again one of the most attractive sides of the Kantian philosophy, whereby pure sensuousness and pure understanding,

which were formerly expressed as absolute opposites, are now united. There is thus here present a perceptive understanding, or an understanding perception; but Kant does not see this, he does not bring these thoughts together: he does not grasp the fact that he here brought both sides of knowledge into one, and has thereby expressed their implicitude. Knowledge itself is in fact the unity and truth of both moments; but with Kant the thinking understanding and sensuousness are both something particular, and they are only united in an external, superficial way, just as a piece of wood and a leg might be bound together by a cord.

(Lectures on the History of Philosophy, III, p. 441)

As with his complaint about trying to learn how to swim before getting into the water, Hegel's complaint that Kant ties concepts and perception together like a leg and a piece of wood is graphic, but needs scrutiny. His objection ultimately seems to move at two levels. In part, he seems to be complaining that there is no necessary connection between Kant's pure forms of intuition and pure concepts of the understanding, thus that we could have a different sort of perception without having to have a different sort of thought; in part, it seems to be that there is no necessary connection between pure concepts of the understanding and particular empirical intuitions, thus that as far as the categories alone are concerned, they could apply to different empirical intuitions or even to none at all, in which case they might well lack all *use* but still preserve their own identity or sense.

To Kant both of these complaints, but especially the latter, would have seemed unintelligible. Because intuition as the presentation of particulars and conceptualization as the connection and classification of them are essentially different activities, the former at least occurring in animals without the latter even if not vice versa, and because it is possible to conceive of the forms of intuition being other than they are without that requiring that the judgmental forms of discursive thought differ from what they are, any claim that both sides of knowledge are one in the sense of there being some single ground for their different formal structures would, in his eyes, have taken on an enormous burden of proof. And for the same reason, because reception of data and the classification of data are two distinct activities, the idea that the categories should in any way necessitate the data to which they are to be applied, or that there is some common source that necessitates both what categories we

have and what data we are to apply them to, would seem equally inexplicable to Kant. For Kant, it is indeed obvious that the human situation requires an effort of applying categories and principles that flow from within to perceptions that arise from without, and thus it is obvious that there is an irremediable element of contingency in the application of the categories to empirical intuitions. In the absence of any powerful argument to the contrary, any denial of such an obvious fact about the human condition would seem to him merely wishful thinking.

Kant did believe that the ideal of a system of knowledge, in which not particular facts but at least particular laws of nature would seem to be as necessary as the entirely formal laws of nature furnished by the categories, is a necessary ideal of human reason. He held this because he believed that causal reasoning requires not just that particular sequences of events appear to be necessitated by higher-order generalizations, but also that those generalizations themselves be lawlike and thus at least apparently necessarily true (see *Critique of Judgment*, Introduction, section V). But precisely because individual laws of nature must also remain inductively tied to the particular objects of our experience, which remain contingent, he held that their necessity could not be more than a regulative ideal, not more than an appearance lent to them by their inclusion in a system of laws, the completeness and uniqueness of which can never be more than asymptotically approached. Thus Kant accepted the ideal of a continuum of necessity reaching from the most-general to the most-particular laws of nature, but not the absolute reality of such a continuum, which Hegel supposed to be possible. But this leads directly to the larger issue of Hegel's critique of Kant's conception of the faculty of reason, so we will turn to that next before further discussion of the issue of regulative ideals.

(iv) The final charge then in Hegel's official brief against Kant's theoretical philosophy takes the form of a critique of Kant's treatment of the faculty of reason instead of sensibility or understanding. This charge can be broken down into two complaints. The first is the claim that in Kant's hands the faculty of reason, in this regard like the faculty of understanding, is *empty*, meaning that it does not supply its own content but is only an apparatus for the organization of information supplied to it from elsewhere. The other claim, which Hegel makes first but which can be considered as at least in

part a consequence of the first, is that, for Kant, reason's ideas of completeness are never granted reality but always remain mere *postulates*. Of course, it is precisely by insisting on these two features of the employment of the faculty of reason that Kant proposed to differentiate his critical philosophy from the dogmatic rationalism that preceded it. In Kant's eyes, by rejecting these aspects of his account of reason, Hegel could not have advanced philosophy but only returned it to the *status quo ante*.

Hegel opens his discussion of Kant in *Faith and Knowledge* with the charge that Kantian reason furnishes only postulates and not knowledge of reality:

When the Kantian philosophy happens upon Ideas [of reason] in its normal course, it deals with them as mere possibilities of thought and as transcendental concepts lacking all reality . . . Kant's philosophy establishes the highest idea as a postulate which is supposed to have a necessary subjectivity, but not that absolute objectivity which would get it recognized as the only starting point by philosophy and its sole content instead of being the point where philosophy terminates in faith. (p. 67)

For Kant, reason introduces ideas of the unconditional simplicity of the self, completeness of the world, and necessity of God. But these ideas themselves do not bring along with them any evidence that these objects have these properties or even, in the case of God, exist; evidence about what objects exist and what properties they have must come from sensibility. Yet human sensibility, shaped by the open-ended structure of space and time, cannot provide evidence of unconditional simplicity or completeness, or of the existence of anything with unconditional necessity. So the ideas of reason can function as regulative but not constitutive ideas, postulates to goad us on in the search for ever more simplicity, completeness, and necessity within our scientific knowledge of self and world (see A 672–4/B 700–2) but never direct evidence of absolutely unconditional simplicity, completeness, and necessity.

The fact that reason depends upon sensibility, judged by understanding, for evidence of the actual existence of any objects is what condemns its ideas to serving as mere postulates or regulative ideals. Hegel recognizes this, and for that reason complains that Kant's account of reason leaves it dependent upon external sources of content. This complaint is voiced later in *Faith and Knowledge*:

Because of this refusal nothing remains for Reason but the pure emptiness of identity . . . after abstracting both from the content that the linking activity has through its connection with the empirical, and from its immanent peculiarity as expressed in the dimensions [forms of intuition?], the empty unity [that remains] is Reason. The intellect is the unity of a possible experience whereas the unity of Reason relates to the intellect and its judgments. In this general determination Reason is raised above the sphere of the intellect's relative identity, to be sure, and this negative character would allow us to conceive of it as absolute identity. But it was raised above intellect only to let the speculative Idea . . . finally sink down completely to formal identity. Kant is quite correct in making this empty unity a merely regulative and not a constitutive principle – for how could something that is utterly without content constitute anything? (*Faith and Knowledge*, p. 80)

Thus Hegel suggests that reason is confined to providing mere postulates or regulative ideals because it does not supply its own content, but is dependent upon an empirical source of content from without.

The claim of the emptiness of Kantian reason is, if anything, even more forcefully stated in the *Encyclopedia*:

In this way thought, at its highest pitch, has to go outside for any determinateness; and although it is continually termed Reason, is out-and-out abstract thinking. And the result of all is that Reason supplied nothing beyond the formal unity required to simplify and systematize experiences; it is a *canon*, not an *organon*, of truth, and can furnish only a *criticism* of knowledge, not a *doctrine* of the infinite. In its final analysis this criticism is summed up in the assertion that in strictness thought is only the indeterminate unity and the action of this indeterminate unity.

Kant undoubtedly held reason to be the faculty of the unconditioned; but if reason be reduced to abstract identity only, it by implication renounces its unconditionality and is in reality no better than empty understanding. For reason is unconditioned only insofar as its character and quality are not due to an extraneous and foreign content, only insofar as it is self-characterizing, and thus, in point of content, is its own master. Kant, however, expressly explains that the action of reason consists solely in applying the categories to systematize the matter given by perception.

(*Encyclopedia*, §52 and §52z, p. 86)

In this passage, Hegel uses Kant's own terminology to report his view precisely, but as it were in a tone of voice diametrically opposed to Kant's own. What Kant sees as the most important result of his account of pure reason Hegel sees as its deepest failure. For Kant,

metaphysics had traditionally supposed that by reason alone we could gain insight into the existence of the soul, the world, and God as possessing, respectively, a kind of simplicity, completeness, and necessity that we can never encounter in the always indefinitely extendible sensible experience of psychological states, space and time, and causal sequences. But when we realize that reason is not itself a source of direct representations of objects but only a source of principles for the regimentation of judgments, and that judgments in turn always require intuitions to secure their reference to particular objects, we must realize that reason itself cannot be a source for the knowledge of any objects. It can only be the source for the systematization of knowledge of objects that is indeed external to itself, and is therefore subject to the limitations inherent in the other faculties that supply its subject-matter. On Kant's view, no account of knowledge can be complete without the specification for a source of information of objects. Any alternative to his own account of the limitation of the faculty of reason would have to show how reason itself furnishes such information. If the ideas of reason could furnish their own content, as Hegel seems to suppose that it ought to, then they could also be freed of their restriction to the status of more regulative ideals or postulates. But at least in his comments on Kant's conception of reason, Hegel gives no suggestion as to how reason is to furnish its own content, or even what that means, *a fortiori* no proof that the contents of reason are free of the indefiniteness of sensible intuitions, which for Kant so limits the status of reason.

There is no room in this essay for a detailed discussion of Hegel's critique of Kant's moral philosophy,¹⁸ but it may be noted in passing that at its deepest level, Hegel's critique of Kant's conception of practical reason precisely mirrors his criticism of the Kantian model of theoretical reason. First, Hegel objects to the emptiness of Kant's conception of practical reason just as he has objected to the emptiness of his conceptions of the categories and the ideas of reason, meaning by this in both cases that reason or understanding does not generate its own content and is therefore dependent on external contingencies. Hegel often expresses his objection to the emptiness of Kant's categorical imperative by saying that it allows for the universalization of any proposed maxim of action, whether good or evil, as long as the agent is consistent in allowing all to act on this

maxim; but his real objection seems to be that the categorical imperative as the fundamental principle of practical reason is empty in the sense of depending upon antecedent desires for proposed goals of action rather than itself furnishing not only a criterion of necessary or permissible actions but the candidates for consideration as well. Hegel hints at this position in *Faith and Knowledge*:

As freedom, Reason is supposed to be absolute, yet the essence of this freedom consists in being solely through an opposite. This contradiction, which remains insuperable in the system and destroys it, becomes a real inconsistency when this absolute emptiness is supposed to give itself content as practical Reason and to expand itself in the form of duties. (p. 81)

The nature of his complaint is made even clearer in the essay *Natural Law*, publication of which began later in the same year as *Faith and Knowledge*. Here he objects that Kant's practical philosophy does not get past the "empirical and popular" view:

(i) that the real, under the name of sensuousness, inclinations, lower appetites, etc. (moment of the multiplicity of the relation), and reason (moment of the pure unity of the relation) do not correspond, this non-correspondence being the moment of the opposition of unity and multiplicity; and (ii) that reason consists in willing out of its own absolute self-identity and autonomy, and in constricting and dominating that sensuousness . . . It must be maintained [however] that, since morality is something absolute, this is not the standpoint of morality and there is no morality in it. (p. 74)

The categorical imperative is liable to the charge of emptiness because it treats desires as something external to itself instead of flowing from some deeper unity of sensible and rational nature.

Second, Hegel thinks that Kant's notion of the highest good, or the conjunction of happiness with virtue as the worthiness to be happy, is doomed to remain a mere postulate of practical reason, which can at best be hoped for from a God who is himself a mere postulate rather than a reality brought about by practical reason itself, because he insists on separating practical reason from its empirical source of content, namely the desires that actually determine an individual's conception of happiness and its fulfillment. Hegel expresses this point by claiming that Kant, and following him Fichte, do nothing but give systematic philosophical expression to the pessimism of Voltaire. They do this by transforming a French *aperçu* into "a universally valid truth it is incapable of":

Because of the absolute subjectivity of Reason and its being set against reality, the world is, then, absolutely opposed to Reason. Hence it is absolute finitude devoid of Reason, a sense-world lacking [internal] organization. It is supposed to become equal to Ego in the course of an infinite progress.

*(Faith and Knowledge, p. 179)*¹⁹

The Kantian idea that we cannot find harmony between happiness and virtue in our natural lives but can only postulate an approach to it in a postulated immortal afterlife ruled by a postulated God is required, Hegel suggests, only because Kant has separated reason and nature as one more instance of his separation between thought and being from the outset. In Hegel's view, this separation is entirely unnecessary.

The same themes thus run throughout Hegel's critique of Kant's practical philosophy and of Kant's theoretical philosophy. Kant leaves the formal principles of thought, whether theoretical understanding and reason or practical reason, dependent upon external sources for their content, and because their content is only externally provided, the character of that content must remain contingent relative to the necessity of the principles themselves. This dualism of form and content, necessity and contingency, is enforced upon Kant by his insistence on separating thought and being. If he did not see thought as a mere formalism dependent upon being external to it for its content, but recognized that thought and being and thus form and content were always identical, or at least flowed from the same source, Hegel thinks that Kant could have seen his way to the higher unity that Hegel supposed he had originally glimpsed in his conceptions of judgment and apperception, but then rejected. But what he does not see is that if Kant had not rigorously separated thought from being, form from content, category from empirical intuition, and rational principle from sensuous nature, then he could have drawn no separation between the necessary and contingent – and in this case necessity would not have flown into the contingent, but rather the contingency of the real and particular would have undermined any claims to necessary truth at more abstract levels of understanding and reason.²⁰

IV. CONCLUSION: THE INTUITIVE INTELLECT AND RADICAL CONTINGENCY

Hegel sums up his critique that Kant glimpsed but refused to admit the identity of thought and being in his discussion of Kant's idea of

an "intuitive intellect." This concept, which Kant introduced late and briefly in the *Critique of Judgment* only to give graphic expression to the inevitable limitations of human cognition,²¹ is treated by Hegel as if it were a glimpse of the deeper reality recognized in Hegel's own philosophy from which Kant had recoiled, virtually as a coward. What is this concept?

At key points in the *Critique of Judgment*, particularly in its Introduction and its second half, the "Critique of Teleological Judgment," Kant stresses several consequences of the most fundamental limitation on human knowledge as he understood it. The most elemental fact about human knowledge, that it always requires the application of a concept formed by understanding to intuitions or representations of particular objects furnished by sensibility – the fact that, as Kant puts it, "two entirely heterogeneous factors, understanding for conceptions and sensuous intuition for the corresponding objects, are required for the exercise" of our cognitive faculties (*Critique of Judgment*, §76, 5:401)²² – is also the source of its most basic limitation, that since representations of particular objects do not derive from the same source as the general concepts we apply to them, the existence and complete determination of particulars cannot be derived from our general concepts of them. As Kant put it, "the particular cannot be derived from the universal alone" (§77, 5:407). The fact that the existence and complete characterizations of its instances can never be derived from any general concept alone means that "Human understanding cannot avoid the necessity of drawing a distinction between the possibility and actuality of things": concepts by themselves merely limn possible objects, and only empirical intuitions demonstrate the actual existence of any particular objects (§76, 5:401–2). And this also means that both the actual existence and detailed determination of its instances must always seem contingent relative to any general concept – since the concept alone cannot imply that it has any instances, let alone that what instances it may have fulfill the partial description of them that is all that any general concept can contain, the general concept itself cannot appear to necessitate the existence or nature of its instances. As Kant puts it, "the particular by its very nature contains something contingent in respect of the universal" (§76, 5:404), or since "the particular is not determined by the universal of *our* (human) understanding," as far as we are concerned, "Though different things may agree in a common characteristic, the variety of forms in which they may be presented to our perception is

may be presented to our perception is contingent" (§77, 5:406). We may express our sense of this fundamental limit and its irremediable implication of an element of contingency in all of our knowledge of particulars by contrasting our own cognitive faculties to the idea of a subject whose intuition is active rather than passive, in particular whose concepts are themselves the source of particulars and all of their determinations. For such an understanding, it would not seem contingent that its general concepts were instantiated and realized by the particular objects that did so, for the particulars would somehow flow from the general concepts; "Such an understanding would not experience the above contingency in the way nature and understanding accord in natural products subjects to particular laws." But, Kant stresses, such an "intuitive understanding" is just an idea to which we can contrast the nature of our own understanding in order to bring out its limitations: "Thus we are also able to imagine an *intuitive* understanding – negatively, or simply as not discursive – which does not move, as ours does with its conceptions, from the universal to the particular and so to the individual" (§77, 5:406). Kant does not suggest that we possess a single shred of evidence that would entitle us to claim to know that such an intuitive understanding itself actually exists, let alone that *our own* understanding can ever take on this form, which if we are even to imagine it must be ascribed to some being other than ourselves.

Kant does describe two contexts in which we are tempted to use the idea of a cognitive agent that is not confined to searching for instantiation of its general concepts among independently given intuitions as more than just a contrast to our own understanding, but rather as a regulative ideal to guide and motivate our cognitive inquiry. First (especially in the Introduction and in §76 of the *Critique of Judgment*) he argues that despite our recognition of the ultimate contingency of the instantiation of our general concepts in particulars, "reason demands that there shall also be unity in the synthesis of the particular laws of nature" or systematicity among all of our empirical concepts. This demand for systematicity has several sources: in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant treats it as a desideratum of reason itself; in the *Critique of Judgment*, Kant suggests that systematicity among particular laws of nature is needed both to give us some assurance that we can always find a law for any particular experience and also to lend an appearance of necessity to particular laws of na-

ture, which they can to some degree derive from their position in a system (see especially *Critique of Judgment*, section V, 5:181–86).²³ Just as we conceive of our own intellect as the source of our most-general concepts of nature, we can think of such as a system of empirical laws as if it were the product of an intellect more powerful than our own that excogitated it for our cognitive convenience (*Critique of Judgment*, section IV, 5:180). But this thought gives us no evidence of the existence of such an intellect; it merely gives us guidance in “our reflection upon the objects of nature with a view to getting a thoroughly interconnected whole of experience” (section V, 5:184), that is to say, a regulative ideal for our practice of empirical judgment.

Second, Kant argues that the implications of our basic cognitive structure lead us to formulate the idea of an alternative kind of understanding in attempting to deal with knowledge of living organisms. Here what limits us is not just that we need intuitions to supplement any of our general concepts, but the more particular fact that our intuitions are always given in time and thus successively. This causes a problem because, in order to understand organisms, we need to conceive of them as if the parts were the antecedent causes of various aspects of the whole, which is compatible with the temporally successive nature of our empirical intuitions, but also as if the whole were itself the cause of various features of its temporally antecedent parts – which is not. In order to cope with this, we postulate the idea of a designer of organisms whose design or “*representation* of a whole may contain the source of the possibility of the form of that whole and of the nexus of the parts which that form involves” (§77, 5:408), and which would thus function as an antecedent cause of the parts of the whole in a way that can be represented compatibly with the sequential nature of our own empirical intuitions. Such a concept could also be taken to eliminate the contingency in the relations of the various parts to the concept of the whole (407). But again, Kant stresses, we have no ground to infer that such an intellect different from our own actually exists: “It is sufficient to show that we are led to this idea of an *intellectus archetypus* by contrasting with it our discursive understanding that has need of images (*intellectus ectypus*)” (408). We only use the idea to reconcile the conceptualization of organisms with the limits of our own understanding, which does not produce particulars but awaits intuitions for knowledge of them.²⁴

Hegel begins his discussion of Kant's concept of an intuitive intellect with an accurate enough description of it, as an intellect "for which possibility and actuality are one" and for which the accord between universal and particular in nature is not contingent (*Faith and Knowledge*, p. 88). But when he goes on to say that "Kant also recognizes that we are necessarily driven to this Idea" of an intuitive intellect, he misstates the case. Kant argued that we can use the idea of such an intellect to bring out, by way of contrast, the limitations of our own, and also that in certain contexts we need to use the idea of such an intellect not actually to overcome the limitations of our own cognitive faculties but merely to guide us to the maximal use of them within their insuperable limitations. But he never argued that we have any basis on which to suppose that such an intellect actually exists, let alone that it exists in ourselves.

Hegel thought that, in the concept of an intuitive intellect, Kant had reached his own idea of the Idea, a mind-like source of concepts that is at the same time the source of reality and thereby makes the fit between concepts and reality necessary rather than contingent. As he puts it in the *Encyclopedia*,

If we adopt this principle, the Idea, when all limitations were removed from it, would appear as follows. The universality molded by Reason, and described as the absolute and final end or the Good, would be realized in the world, and realized moreover by means of a third thing, the power which proposes this end as well as realizes it – that is, God. Thus in him, who is the absolute truth, these oppositions of universal and individual, subjective and objective, are solved and explained to be neither self-subsistent nor true.

(*Encyclopedia*, §59, p. 90)

For Hegel, the idea of an intuitive intellect overcomes not only the opposition between thought and being but also even that between theoretical and practical reason, for of course the thought which is necessarily realized by such a being would also be necessarily good. But Kant never conceded the rational necessity of positing the existence of such an understanding in ourselves for a moment, at least in any context of theoretical philosophy; he only employed the *idea* of such a form of understanding in a being greater than ourselves for contrastive and regulative purposes.²⁵

Hegel was obviously upset by the fact that the "Idea occurs [to Kant] here only as thought" (*Faith and Knowledge*, p. 89): "This makes it

all the harder to see the Rational being muddled up again, and not just that, but to see the highest Idea corrupted with full consciousness, while reflection and finite cognition are exalted above it" (p. 92). He attributed Kant's denial of the "actual realization of the ultimate end," his "clinging hard to the disjunction of the notion from reality" to mere "laziness of thought" (*Encyclopedia*, §55, p. 88), or claimed that "Kant has simply no ground except experience and empirical psychology" for denying the reality of the intuitive intellect as the ultimate truth about human thought itself (*Faith and Knowledge*, p. 89). But Kant's hard-fought conclusion that the fundamental distinction between intuition and concept was the only way to avoid the philosophical confusions of Leibniz and Wolff, on the one hand, and Locke and Hume, on the other, can hardly be attributed to laziness of thought, and it seems equally implausible to characterize Kant's insistence on the need for reception of information about the particulars of nature as well as conceptualization as mere "empirical psychology." It is far too basic a fact, and compatible with far too many particular cognitive psychologies, to be treated as if it were just some sort of empirically verifiable or, more to the point, falsifiable observation. On the contrary, it is virtually impossible to imagine what it would be like to produce evidence for particulars out of mere concepts – except perhaps in the case of pure mathematics, where we can construct formal objects in accord with our definitions of them. If Kant was guilty of any laziness, it may have been only in suggesting that it is easy for us to *imagine* an intuitive understanding; it may be easy for us to verbally *describe* such a thing, but impossible actually to *imagine* it.

In any case it seems safe to say that, at least in his explicit discussions of Kant, Hegel makes no attempt to explain how concepts could actually produce their own instances, which is what he would have to do in order to prove the existence of an intuitive intellect as defined by Kant. In fact, he makes no attempt to provide direct criticism of Kant's grounds for separating intuition from concept and thus particular from universal. Instead, he appeals to one of his typical metaphors. He claims that "No one knows, or even feels, that anything is a limit or defect, until he is at the same time above and beyond it," thus that "a limit or imperfection in knowledge comes to be termed a limit or imperfection, only when it is compared with the actually present Idea of the universal," and that "to call a thing finite or limited proves by implication the very presence

of the infinite and unlimited" (*Encyclopedia*, §60, p. 92; see also *Faith and Knowledge*, p. 89). Thus he tries to suggest that Kant cannot merely appeal to the idea of an intuitive intellect to bring out the limits of our own discursive intellect, but must concede its reality in the very attempt to place any limits upon our own intellect. But this form of argument, which was introduced into modern philosophy in Descartes's *Third Meditation* but can be traced all the way back to Plato and Augustine,²⁶ is not only one of the oldest arguments in the philosophers' book, it is also one of the worst. It simply is not true that one must recognize the existence of something that does not have a certain property in order to conceive of that property as a defect or limit. I can treat being liable to doubt as a defect or limit simply because I can see how nice it would be not to have to doubt, without having the least reason to suppose that anything exists that is not liable to this limitation, or I can treat being mortal as a limit if I think it would be nice to live forever without having any reason to think there is any creature that is immortal. In the same way, I can treat being dependent upon intuitions which are independent of my concepts as a limitation because it introduces an ineliminable element of contingency into my knowledge-claims without having the least reason to believe that there actually exists any cognitive agent that is not liable to this limitation. Thus Hegel cannot prove that Kant is committed to the reality of an intuitive intellect by the use of the idea of it to give expression to his conception of the limitations of human knowledge. He could not prove that the contingency inherent in Kant's dual sources of knowledge is eliminable except by a positive explanation of how understanding and reason could lead to knowledge without empirical intuitions which are independent of thought and thus contingent relative to it.

Hegel wrote as if he had offered detailed refutations of some of Kant's central theses, but in fact he hardly engaged in internal criticism of Kant's arguments at all. Instead, he criticized Kant's conclusions from the point of view of his own suppositions about the bond between knowledge and reality. In Hegel's view, Kant was guilty of leaving unnecessary contingency both at the general level, in his account of the forms of intuitions and categories, and at the particular level, in his account of the instantiation of these general forms of

nature in individual objects and laws of nature. Kant would not have denied these charges. On the contrary, he viewed the latter contingency as the inevitable outcome of the fundamental difference between concepts and intuitions itself, and the former as the inevitable price to pay for the fact that we can explain our *a priori* knowledge of both forms of intuitions and categories only as a product of their subjective validity, with no possibility of explaining just why our subjective faculties of cognition are constituted in just this and no other way. His objection would not be to Hegel's account of his system – except insofar as Hegel ascribes it to laziness or mere empirical psychology – but only to Hegel's suggestion that there is an alternative. Hegel's alternative would require the elimination of the contingency in the forms of intuition and categories by the deduction of them from some single underlying idea, and the elimination of the contingency in the realization of these abstract forms of thought by the identity of thought and being and thus the derivation of both universal and particulars from some single source. Kant would have been very surprised if Hegel could have made good on these promises.

NOTES

- 1 For reasons of space, this essay will be confined to the issue of thought and being rather than action and being, that is, to theoretical rather than practical philosophy (one brief digression on the latter will be treated more fully in the essay by Allen W. Wood in chapter 7, this collection). [Also see the article by Kenneth Westphal, chapter 8.] For a sense of the full scope of Hegel's critique of Kant, see the volume edited by Stephen Priest, *Hegel's Critique of Kant* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), which contains a general survey by the editor and twelve individual essays by eleven authors. The first six of these, by Michael Inwood, Graham Bird, Justus Harnack, John Llewellyn, Stephen Priest, and W. Walsh, are relevant to the topics of the present essay. The best single treatment of these issues is Karl Ameriks, "Hegel's Critique of Kant's Theoretical Philosophy," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 45 (1985): 1–35. For literature on Hegel's critique of Kant's practical philosophy, see note 18 below. A volume devoted specifically to Hegel's interpretation of the aesthetic, teleological, and systematic themes of the *Critique of Judgment* is *Hegel und die "Kritik der Urteilskraft"*, ed. Hans-Friedrich Fulda and Rolf-Peter Horstmann (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1990). I have discussed Hegel's critique of Kant's aesthetics in the volume: "Hegel on

- Kant's Aesthetics: Necessity and Contingency in Beauty and Art," pp. 81–99.
- 2 This work dates from relatively late in Hegel's career – it was first published in 1817 but was substantially revised in 1827 and 1830 – but does not differ in essentials from what he had already been arguing for several decades. The main elements of Hegel's critique of Kant, in both theoretical and practical philosophy, appear to have undergone little change after his first publications including explicit criticism of Kant, the essays "Faith and Knowledge" ("Faith and Knowledge: or the "Reflective Philosophy of Subjectivity" in the complete range of its forms as Kantian, Jacobian, and Fichtean Philosophy"), published in the *Critical Journal of Philosophy* edited by Hegel and Schelling in 1802, and "Natural Law" ("The Scientific Ways of Treating Natural Law, Its Place in Moral Philosophy, and Its Relation to the Positive Sciences of Law") published in the same journal in 1802–3. For that reason I will draw on both these earlier and the later works in this essay without any attempt to demonstrate an evolution in Hegel's views about Kant. "Faith and Knowledge" is cited from the translation by Walter Cerf and H.S. Harris (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977), "Natural Law" in the translation by T.M. Knox (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975), and the *Encyclopedia* in the translation by William Wallace, *Hegel's Logic: Being Part One of the Encyclopedia and Philosophical Sciences* (1830), 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).
 - 3 The "z" indicates that the passage is an addendum (*Zusatz*) drawn from Hegel's lectures on the *Encyclopedia* and originally published in the version (edited by Leopold Henning) included in the edition of Hegel's works published after his death by the "*Freunde des verewigten*" (1840). These passages are not included in all modern German editions, but are included in Wallace's translation. I do not believe that philological scruples should preclude their use, since this material, like Hegel's whole lecture series on history, history of philosophy, and aesthetics, was published soon after Hegel's death by a group of Hegel's students, using copious notes in both his own hand and those of others. There seems little reason to doubt that these materials accurately portray Hegel's intentions.
 - 4 In this essay I will use the translation by Norman Kemp Smith, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1933), but will give only the pagination of Kant's first edition of 1781 ("A") and second edition of 1787 ("B"), which is reproduced in Kemp Smith's edition and therefore obviates the need to cite his own pagination.
 - 5 The interpretation of both the meaning of and the argument for Kant's so-called transcendental idealism, which I have given here, is controver-

- sial. For a fuller defense of it, as well as references to further literature, see my *Kant and the Claims of Knowledge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), chap. 16, pp. 345–70.
- 6 To preserve symmetry with the other three sets of categories, each of which has three specific forms, Kant attempts to define a third category of quality by distinguishing between “negative” judgments, which simply deny a predicate of an object, and “infinite” judgments, which affirm that an object is characterized by one of the infinite predicates remaining after the exclusion of a specific one (“x is non-F” as opposed to “x is not F”) (A 72–73/B 97–98). This distinction, needed to reach the canonical twelve functions of judgment rather than the eleven mentioned above, has found few friends. There are also further difficulties in Kant’s move from twelve logical functions of judgments to twelve pure concepts of objects (A 80/B 106), but they will be ignored here.
 - 7 For a consideration of some of the interpretative difficulties of this argument and references to further literature on it, see Paul Guyer, “The Transcendental Deduction of the Categories,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*, ed. Paul Guyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 123–60. For a discussion of Hegel’s difficulties with the transcendental deduction, see Ameriks, “Hegel’s Critique of Kant’s Theoretical Philosophy,” pp. 5–13.
 - 8 Kant also argues that there is a *practical* justification for the formation of the idea of and postulation of the existence of God, a moral imperative to posit the existence of God in order to reconcile the apparent lack of harmony between virtue and happiness, but he always argues that this practical postulate never amounts to knowledge in any form.
 - 9 See *Hegel’s Lecture on the History of Philosophy*, trans. E.S. Haldane and Frances H. Simson (London: Routledge Kegan Paul, 1896), Vol. III, 423–78, and *Lectures on the History of Philosophy: The Lectures of 1825–1826*, ed. Robert F. Brown (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), Vol. III, 217–29.
 - 10 See, for example, Moltke S. Gram, *Kant, Ontology and the A Priori* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968), chap. 3, which argues that Kant is actually committed to two different accounts of judgment, an explicit theory like that now to be described and also an implicit theory on which intuitions are literally parts of judgments.
 - 11 For an interpretation of Hegel stressing this aspect, see Rolf-Peter Horstmann, *Ontologie und Relationen: Hegel, Bradley, Russel und die Kontroverse über interne und externe Beziehungen* (Königstein: Athenäum-Hain, 1984).
 - 12 This conception of method is contrasted to the synthetical or progressive method supposedly employed in the *Critique of Pure Reason* in the

introduction to Kant's 1783 attempt at a clarification and popularization of the *Critique*, his *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics* (4:264). The idea is supposed to be that the analytical method assumes the existence of certain synthetic *a priori* knowledge and shows that the possession of certain *a priori* forms of intuition or thought is the only possible explanation of such knowledge, whereas the synthetic method does not begin with such an outright assumption of synthetic *a priori* knowledge. In fact, much of Kant's argument in the *Critique* also begins with the assumption of synthetic *a priori* knowledge, and the only difference is the degree of generality of that which is assumed, with the *Critique* emphasizing arguments beginning with the extremely general idea of synthetic *a priori* knowledge of the unity and identity of self-consciousness (the transcendental unity of apperception) and the *Prolegomena* focusing on more-specific premises about synthetic *a priori* knowledge in mathematics and physical science.

- 13 For further discussion of this issue, see Ameriks, "Hegel's Critique of Kant's Theoretical Philosophy," pp. 15–21.
- 14 There is a long history of discussion of the completeness of Kant's table of categories. For the most-recent discussion, and a very insightful one, see Reinhard Brandt, *Die Urteilstafel: Kritik der reinen Vernunft A 67–76; B 92–101*, Kant-Forschungen, Vol. 4 (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1991).
- 15 Twentieth-century logicians, especially those working in the first half of the century, have taken great pleasure in demonstrating that any exhaustive representation of the logically possible structures of judgments can be characterized through an even more-austere set of functions than Kant employed. See, for example, W.V. Quine, *Methods of Logic*, rev. ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1959), 7–12.
- 16 I am referring to the Leibniz of the mid-1680s, the period of works such as "The Discourse on Metaphysics" and "Primary Truths," where Leibniz suggests that the principle of sufficient reason is itself derivable from the principle that the predicate of a true proposition is always contained in its subject, as opposed to the later Leibniz of the period of "The Monadology," where Leibniz treats these as two equally fundamental principles.
- 17 Kant discusses the schematism at A 136–47/B 176–87. For this interpretation of it, see *Kant and the Claims of Knowledge*, chap. 6, 157–66.
- 18 For more detailed discussion of this issue, see the essay by Allen Wood in this volume. (Chapter 7). For further discussion, see Karl Ameriks, "The Hegelian Critique of Kantian Morality," *New Essays on Kant*, ed. Bernard den Ouden and Marcia Moen (New York: Peter Lang, 1987), 179–212; Sally S. Sedgwick, "Hegel's Critique of the Subjective Idealism of Kant's Ethics," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 26 (1988): 89–

- 105, and "On the Relation of Pure Reason to Content: A Reply to Hegel's Critique of Formalism in Kant's Ethics," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 49 (1988): 59–80; and Allen W. Wood, *Hegel's Ethical Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), chap. 9, 154–73.
- 19 This passage occurs in Hegel's discussion of Fichte rather than Kant. But he has earlier referred the reader to the discussion of Fichte for the discussion of his criticism of the Kantian conception of practical reason (p. 85)
- 20 In an important essay, Dieter Henrich tries to defend Hegel from the charge that he attempted to find claims of necessary truth about particular objects by claiming that Hegel's concept of reality includes the requirement that necessity posit its own opposite and thus entails the existence of contingency ("Hegels über den Zufall," in his *Hegel im Kontext* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1971), 157–86). But this seems like a merely verbal solution, and in any case does not address the charge that Hegel fails to see that from the Kantian point of view the contingency of particular facts is ineliminable because of the duality of sources of knowledge (and, for that matter, motivation as well).
- 21 The term "intuitive intellect" (*intuitive* or *anschauliche Verstand*) is used only in §§76–77 of the *Critique of Judgment* to characterize the conceptual possibility of an understanding whose *particular objects* would somehow – of course we cannot say how – be derived from its concepts. The inverted expression "intellectual intuition" is employed several times in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (see B 72) to connote the related but distinct idea of an understanding that would not need the *pure forms* of intuition to relate to objects. In both cases, the idea is clearly intended only to characterize the nature of our own cognition, not to assert that such an alternative is actually instantiated in any real being.
- 22 For present purposes I have followed the translation by J.C. Meredith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911 and 1928). Page citations are to volume 5 to *Kant's gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin: Georg Reimer [later Walter de Gruyter], 1913), which are reproduced in the margins of Meredith's translation.
- 23 I have discussed the grounds for Kant's conception of systematicity in "Kant's Concept of Empirical Law," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume* 67 (1990): 221–42).
- 24 Of course, since the time of Darwin we have been able to see that Kant's problem with the conceptualization of organisms is not due to the temporally successive nature of our empirical knowledge of causation itself, but rather to an overly restricted conception of the temporally succes-

sive causal mechanisms at work in nature, that is to say, to his ignorance of random mutation and natural selection as perfectly mechanical, temporally sequential causal processes.

- 25 For further discussion of Hegel's treatment of the "intuitive intellect," see Fulda and Horstmann, eds., *Hegel und die "Kritik der Urteilskraft"*, particularly the articles by Klaus Düsing, "Naturteleologie und Metaphysik bei Kant und Hegel," pp. 141–157, and Burkhard Tuschling, "Intuitiver Verstand, absolute Identität, Idee," pp. 174–88.
- 26 See Alasdair MacIntyre, *Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy, and Tradition* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990), 95.