

# PHIL 374: Kant & 19th-Century Philosophy

Fall Term 2016-17

© Curtis Sommerlatte, Department of Philosophy, Concordia University, 2016

Office: M-110 (2145 Mackay)  
E-Mail Address: [curtis.sommerlatte@concordia.ca](mailto:curtis.sommerlatte@concordia.ca) (preferred form of contact)  
Office Telephone: (514) 848-2424 x2597  
Office Hours: Tue. 10:30-12:00, or by appointment  
Class Time: Thursdays, 14:45-17:30  
Class Location: SGW H-564

## ABOUT THIS COURSE

### Calendar Description

This course examines Kant and some of the main currents of post-Kantian philosophy, possibly including Hegel and post-Hegelians, the romantic reaction, positivism, and pragmatism.

Prerequisite: Six credits in Philosophy, or permission of the Department.

NOTE: Students who have received credit for PHIL 474 may not take this course for credit.

### Expanded Course Description

Immanuel Kant's new "critical philosophy" invigorated German philosophers to address new and traditional philosophical problems with new approaches. Kant's philosophy was so ground-breaking that it played a key role in the developments of several intellectual philosophical movements, including German Romanticism, German Idealism, Phenomenology, and eventually Existentialism. In the nineteenth-century, three features of Kant's philosophy were particularly influential: its analysis of the cognitive subject as central to systematizing our knowledge, its critical evaluation of metaphysics, and its emphasis on human beings' autonomy. This course will focus on these three themes of Kant's philosophy and how they were taken up by Johann Gottlieb Fichte and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel.

The course will begin with Kant's most important work, the *Critique of Pure Reason* (published in two versions, but we shall focus on the second or "B" edition), which established his system of critical or transcendental philosophy. We will ease our way into this notoriously difficult work by considering its intellectual context, especially the problems with which Kant's contemporaries were concerned. Kant responded to these problems by approaching these problems in a new way, namely by investigating the conditions necessary for the possibility of experience and by investigating whether "synthetic a priori cognition" is possible (i.e., whether we can know informative truths independently of any particular experiences).

After considering Kant's approach, we shall then examine how he carries out his project. First, he argues that space and time are a priori forms of our mind's faculty of "sensibility" or

intuition. He infers from this his notorious doctrine of “transcendental idealism”, which holds that we can have knowledge only of appearances (objects that are presented to us in our experience) but not things-in-themselves (objects that exist independently of our experience, e.g., super-sensible entities such as God). Kant’s account of space and time (in addition to raising problems of its own) deals with some of the problems he was attempting to resolve. But Kant held that our experience involves more than representations provided to us through our faculty of sensibility; for in our experience we also apply concepts to objects in judgments (which occurs through the faculty of “understanding”). But some of these concepts might not be legitimately applied to experience, as David Hume had raised questions about how we can know whether and how the concepts of cause & effect apply to the objects we experience. Kant’s next task, then, is to give an account of how our faculty of understanding furnishes a priori concepts that make experience possible, and thereby provide us with synthetic a priori cognition.

Kant goes on to offer a critique of metaphysics, and he attempts to demonstrate further his transcendental idealism by showing that its problems are best resolved if we acknowledge that we cannot know answers to metaphysical questions such as whether our souls are immortal, whether God exists, whether we have free will, etc. Although Kant holds that, at least from a disinterested theoretical standpoint, we cannot know that we have free will, his practical philosophy places free will and autonomy at the foundation of his account of ethics or morality. Kant presents the foundations for this in his *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, which presents what he calls the “supreme principle of morality” or “categorical imperative”.

The above covers much of Kant’s critical project, but Kant’s contemporaries were not fully content with it. We will accordingly consider next Fichte’s philosophy, which initially aimed at defending the spirit of Kant’s philosophy from objections common at the time. Despite defending the spirit of the critical philosophy, Fichte nevertheless modified the “letter” of it. Namely, he placed an even greater emphasis on understanding subjectivity as the foundation of both theoretical and practical philosophy. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily result in solipsism, as we shall see how Fichte argues that a single subjectivity or mind is possible only if there are other minds.

Others were not so happy with taking subjectivity to be so fundamental and did not see it as resolving all of the problems with the critical philosophy. Likewise, not all were convinced that Kant’s critique of metaphysics was successful. Most prominent of those who thought this way was Hegel. His first major work, *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, challenges Kant’s understanding of how reason was supposedly limited. Hegel provided a new approach to philosophical problems, one that is “dialectical” and historical. With this new approach, he provides a new conception of reason and argues that it plays an immanent role in the unfolding of history. But Hegel builds on the thought of Kant and Fichte in presenting his famous “master-slave dialectic”, where he provides his accounts of self-consciousness, our relation to other minds, and the role of struggle in our interpersonal relations. Despite this gloomy picture of interpersonal relationships, Hegel also embraced the notions of freedom and autonomy in providing accounts of morality and ethics.

## Required Texts (Available in the Concordia Bookstore and on reserve at the Concordia Library)

- [CPR] Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Edited and translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999. ISBN: 0-521-65729-6.
- [GW] Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited and translated by Allen W. Wood. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002. ISBN: 0-300-09487-6.
- [HR] Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Hegel Reader*. Edited by Stephen Houlgate. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 1998. ISBN: 0-631-20347-8.

Any readings (required or recommended) not found in these books will be provided as PDFs through Course Reserves (which can be found through the course's Moodle page).

## Course Objectives

By the end of the semester, a successful student will:

- (a) understand the basic problems dealt with by Kant, Fichte, and Hegel, e.g., the nature of conscious experience, the status of metaphysics, the nature of freedom, etc.;
- (b) be able to sympathetically outline and present the ideas and arguments of these philosophers; and,
- (c) be able to critically evaluate these philosophers' arguments, i.e., by raising objections to arguments and recognizing whether/how someone could defend/modify the original argument.

## Organization of Classroom Hours & Readings

Class sessions will combine lecture and discussion. **The aim of the lecture** is to clarify key issues, theses, and arguments in the readings. Hence, my lectures are aimed at helping you achieve aim (a) above. But this requires work from you. For each class session, I expect you to have **already done the reading assigned for that day** and to **have the reading in class**. This is crucially important since the lectures will presume familiarity with the readings and since your comprehension of the lectures and the texts is evaluated by course assignments. You should allot 3-4 hours/week for reading. Online summaries are not substitutes for the actual texts. If you want additional resources for understanding the texts, you should contact me.

**The aim of classroom discussion** is to have you critically engage with the texts, e.g., by attempting to interpret difficult passages or by evaluating the strength of an author's arguments. Hence, classroom discussion is practice for achieving aims (b) and (c) above, both of which aims are evaluated on assignments. Thus, active participation in classroom discussion is crucial for doing well in the course.

## Note on Attendance

It is your responsibility to be active and engaged in your education. As mentioned above, in-class lectures and discussions are crucial to achieving aims (a)-(c) of the course, especially given the course's difficult texts. Accordingly, students who skip class tend to do more poorly.

**Students who do poorly on assignments and who miss class often should not expect**

extensive comments on their assignments, since it wastes my time to repeat my lessons.

### Requirements & Grading Scheme

Assignment	Description	Weighting for Grade
Participation	I will keep a record of classroom participation, which will be facilitated with in-class worksheets, group work, etc. If you have any reservations about being graded on the basis of in-class participation, please consult with me early in the semester for accommodations.	20%
Exercise	The first writing exercise of 1,000 words is designed both to test your understanding of Kant's basic distinctions in the <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i> and to give you a sense of how your writing will be evaluated in this course. <b>DUE SEPTEMBER 22</b>	20%
Paper #1	This roughly 2,000-word essay will require to answer one of four prompts, which concern the following topics: 1) Kant's arguments that space and time are a priori forms of intuition 2) Kant's antinomy of freedom 3) Kant's discussion of "moral worth" and "acting from duty" 4) Kant's first formulation of the "categorical imperative" <b>DUE NOVEMBER 3</b>	25%
Paper #2	This last paper of the course (roughly 2,500-3,000 words) will focus on either Hegel on his own or in relation to Kant or Fichte. Possible topics include, for example, Hegel's discussion of "sense-certainty", the famous "master-slave dialectic". <b>DUE DECEMBER 1</b>	35%

### Note on Changes to the Course

*IN THE EVENT OF EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND THE UNIVERSITY'S CONTROL, THE CONTENT AND/OR EVALUATION SCHEME IN THIS COURSE IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE.*

## POLICIES, STUDENTS' RIGHTS, AND SERVICES

### Academic Integrity

You ought to be familiar with Concordia's policies regarding academic integrity, found here: <https://www.concordia.ca/students/academic-integrity.html>. Of particular note is the following:

The most common offense under the Academic Code of Conduct is plagiarism, which the Code defines as **"the presentation of the work of another person as one's own or without proper acknowledgement"** (Article 16a).

This could be material copied word for word from books, journals, internet sites, professor's course notes, etc. It could be material that is paraphrased but closely resembles the original source. It could be the work of a fellow student, for example, an answer on a quiz, data for a lab report, a paper or assignment completed by another student. It might be a paper purchased through one of the many available sources. Plagiarism does not refer to words alone - it can also refer to copying images, graphs, tables, and ideas. "Presentation" is not limited to written work. It also includes oral presentations, computer assignments and artistic works. If you translate the work of another person into French or English and do not cite the source, this is also plagiarism. If you cite your own work without the correct citation, this too is plagiarism.

In Simple Words: **DO NOT COPY, PARAPHRASE OR TRANSLATE ANYTHING FROM ANYWHERE WITHOUT SAYING FROM WHERE YOU GOT IT! DON'T FORGET TO USE QUOTATION MARKS!**

For more information, see here: <https://www.concordia.ca/students/academic-integrity/plagiarism.html> or consult with me. For this course, my policy for any detected academic dishonesty will be to report it directly to the Vice-Dean of Academic Affairs.

### **Gender-Neutral Language & Human Diversity**

In support of both diversity and good philosophical thinking, it is advised that you use gender-neutral language. In this class, there are no strict rules enforced regarding gender-neutral language, but I advise consulting the American Philosophical Association's [Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language](#).

### **Students with Disabilities**

Please contact the Access Centre for Students with Disabilities (ACSD) if you have a documented physical, psychological, medical, or learning disability (or if you have questions regarding your status regarding disabilities). Students with disabilities are entitled to accommodations, and if you need accommodations for this course, please contact ACSD as soon as possible:

- Address: 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. W., H-580
- Telephone: 514-848-2424 ex.3525
- E-mail: [acsinfo@alcor.concordia.ca](mailto:acsinfo@alcor.concordia.ca)
- Website: <http://www.concordia.ca/students/accessibility.html>

**Accommodations will not be granted retrospectively or by the instructor personally. Please contact this office immediately for assistance.**

### **Religious Holidays and Observances**

Please advise me in early in the term if you plan to take religious holidays. This will ensure that I can accommodate appropriately.

### **Right to Write Assignment in French**

All students have the right to write assignments in French. I highly prefer that assignments be written in English, but if you would prefer to write an assignment in French, please notify me in advance so that we can work out the details.

## Student Services

Program Director for Philosophy: <a href="#">Emilia Angelova</a>	<a href="#">Concordia Library Citation &amp; Style Guides</a> (I prefer Chicago Style)
<a href="#">Counselling &amp; Psychological Services</a>	<a href="#">Dean of Students Office</a>
<a href="#">Financial Aid and Awards</a>	<a href="#">Health Services</a>
<a href="#">International Students Office</a>	<a href="#">New Student Program</a>
<a href="#">Student Advocacy Office</a>	<a href="#">Student Hub</a>
<a href="#">Student Resources</a>	<a href="#">Student Success Centre</a>

## SUBMISSION AND GRADING OF ASSIGNMENTS

### Philosophy Department Statement Regarding Grades and Grade Distribution

- 1) The Undergraduate Calendar 16.3 specifies that As, Bs, and Cs are for “outstanding,” “very good” and “satisfactory” work, respectively. The Philosophy Department interprets this to mean that: Cs are awarded for work that is adequate, yet in some way fails to completely meet all expectations and requirements; Bs are awarded for work that fully meets all expectations and requirements; As are reserved for outstanding work that exceeds expectations and requirements by, e.g., demonstrating outstanding rigour, clarity, or insight.
- 2) In 200 & 300 level courses with over 30 students, it is **normally** expected that: the grade average will be in the C+ to B- range; there will be no more than 25% As.

**Note:** This is **not** a “bell curve” or a quota system, but rather a guideline clarifying at the outset the **expectations** for graded assignments in this course. Your grade will not be “reduced” or “inflated,” but rather will always be given its appropriate grade based on the descriptions below.

*Letter-Grade Conversion Chart:*

Outstanding		Very Good		Satisfactory		Marginal Pass		Poor/Fail	
Grade	%	Grade	%	Grade	%	Grade	%	Grade	%
A+	90-100	B+	77-79.9	C+	67-69.9	D+	57-59.9	F	0-49.9
A	85-89.9	B	73-76.9	C	63-66.9	D	53-56.9		
A-	80-84.9	B-	70-72.9	C-	60-62.9	D-	50-52.9		

### My Interpretation of the Department and University Policy on Grades

Drawing upon the interpretation and formulation of these policies used by the current Chairperson of the Philosophy Department, here is my understanding of these policies. **The key point for you to note in the above policy is that assignments and papers that fully meet**

expectations and requirements will be awarded a grade in **the B-range** if they do not go above and beyond the requirements and expectations. An assignment must **significantly exceed** the requirements and expectations to receive a grade in **the A-range**.

- **An “A” paper is outstanding.** It meets all expectations and requirements, but exceeds them in significant ways. For instance, a paper of this quality may do one or more of the following: is exceptionally well-composed, well-argued and rigorous; demonstrates exceptional rigour or an exceptional understanding of the wider questions and scholarly significance of the issues discussed; shows sharp philosophical insight and ability, or independent thinking; represents substantial insight or is the result of careful reflection and research. Generally, a paper will not receive an “A” if it contains mistakes/flaws/errors in writing.
- **A “B” paper is very good.** It fully meets all the expectations and requirements with regard to deadlines, length, content, presentation, documenting references, argumentation, and so forth. It shows that the student has developed a very good understanding of the assigned readings, of the lectures, and of the specific task of the assignment.
- **A “C” paper is satisfactory.** It generally meets the expectations of the assignment and demonstrates adequate knowledge of the course material, but falls short in crucial respects. For example, the author does not demonstrate very good understanding of the material; key concepts or aspects are not mentioned; an argument lacks coherence or logical structure; the paper just gathers points without showing their relation or putting them together in a cohesive form (in developed lines of argument, reasoning, or exposition); the work is not well written and/or displays too many grammar and spelling errors, and so on.
- **A “D” paper is marginal.** It does not meet the general expectations and requirements of the assignment. While it endeavours to meet the specific criteria, it shows flaws and gaps in knowledge of the course material that prevent it from being coherent or from taking into account relevant sources, ideas, and arguments.
- **An “F” paper is poor/failing.** Work that receives an “F” makes no serious attempt to meet the formal and substantial requirements, or was not handed in at all. The flaws and gaps in understanding are so grave that the reader cannot detect a concerted effort to appropriate and use the course material.

**Please also consult with grading rubric below.**

Also note that when I mark papers, I assign it a letter grade. For that letter grade, I then record a percentage equivalent. My calculation of the final course grade is thus based **on percentage equivalents (not grade point equivalents)**.

### **Late Submissions and Extensions**

- Any request for an extension must be received before the deadline or it will not be accepted, or as soon as reasonably possible in the case of an emergency medical situation in fairness to all students, there will be **no exceptions** to this policy.

- It is your responsibility to ensure that if you are unable to complete your work by the deadline or complete an exam on the assigned date, you must request an extension beforehand via e-mail ([curtis.sommerlatte@concordia.ca](mailto:curtis.sommerlatte@concordia.ca)).
- Extensions will be granted **only** to students who are able to provide **a reasonable and verifiable medical note**. Medical notes must include dates within which you are excused from work/school. Vacations and travel plans (work-related or otherwise) are **not considered valid reasons** for late submissions of or an inability to complete assignments, and exams.
- In the case of emergencies, it is your responsibility to notify me via e-mail ([curtis.sommerlatte@concordia.ca](mailto:curtis.sommerlatte@concordia.ca)) as soon as possible in order to determine the course of action required for the matter at hand.
- Organize your time effectively to ensure that you submit your work on time. Any work submitted after the deadline is considered late and will be **penalized 1/3 of a letter grade per day, weekends included** (e.g., a paper whose content earns an A+ will be given a grade of A- if turned in 2 days late).
- To avoid any chance of a late penalty, it is highly advised that all written assignments be **both emailed and submitted in hardcopy**.
- You are responsible for keeping backup copies of your assignments. That is, it is your responsibility if you lose an assignment due to unforeseen circumstances, e.g., a computer crash. It is highly recommended that you keep **multiple** backups of every assignment, and to use multiple backup types: one or more physical (USB key or backup external hard drive) and one or more in the cloud (services such as Dropbox, Google Drive, Microsoft OneDrive, CrashPlan).
- Please note that you are responsible for the version of the work you submit. If you turn in the incorrect version of your work, you can resubmit the correct version prior to the deadline. If you fail to meet the deadline, the version of your work received is the one that will be graded.
- In addition, please note that it is your responsibility to ensure that your assignment is received before the deadline. Should you be unable to submit your work via Moodle or as a hard copy, you must submit your work via e-mail to me ([curtis.sommerlatte@concordia.ca](mailto:curtis.sommerlatte@concordia.ca)) before the deadline. Please give yourself enough time for online submissions to send your assignments via e-mail should a technical issue arise.
- Note the following from the Calendar (16.3.9.2): "Students are responsible for the preservation of any material, in its entire and original form, which has been returned to them."
- **Missed exam?** See: <http://registrar.concordia.ca/exam/faqdef.html>



## Grading Rubric for Philosophy Papers

	<b>The A paper</b>	<b>The B paper</b>	<b>The C paper</b>	<b>The D paper</b>	<b>The F paper</b>
<b>Ideas/thesis</b>	Excels in responding to assignment. Interesting, demonstrates sophistication of thought. Central idea/thesis is clearly communicated, worth developing; limited enough to be manageable, but sharp or deep enough to allow room for thinking. Paper recognizes some complexity of its thesis: may acknowledge its contradictions, qualifications, or limits and follow out their logical implications. Understands and critically evaluates its sources, appropriately limits and defines terms.	A solid paper, responding appropriately to assignment. Clearly states a thesis/central idea, but may have minor lapses in development. Begins to acknowledge the complexity of central idea and the possibility of other points of view. Shows careful reading of sources, and at least some ability to analyze and critically evaluate sources. Attempts to define terms, not always successfully.	Adequate but weaker and less effective, possibly responding less well to assignment. Presents central idea in general terms, often depending on platitudes or clichés, or repeating points without genuinely explaining them. Usually does not acknowledge other views. Shows basic comprehension of sources, but with lapses in or absence of understanding. If it defines terms, often depends on dictionaries, etc.	Does not have a clear central idea or does not respond appropriately to the assignment. Thesis may be too vague or obvious to be developed effectively. Paper may misunderstand sources.	Does not respond to the assignment, lacks a thesis or central idea, and may neglect to use sources where necessary.
<b>Organization &amp; coherence</b>	Uses a logical structure appropriate to paper's subject, purpose, audience, thesis, and disciplinary field. Sophisticated transitional sentences often develop one idea from the previous one or identify their logical relations. It guides the reader through the chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.	Shows a logical progression of ideas and uses fairly sophisticated transitional devices; e.g., may move from least to more important idea. Some logical links may be faulty, but each paragraph clearly relates to paper's central idea.	May list ideas or arrange them randomly rather than using any evident logical structure. May use transitions, but they are likely to be sequential (first, second, third) rather than logic-based. While each paragraph may relate to central idea, logic is not always clear. Paragraphs have topic sentences but may be overly general, and arrangement of sentences within paragraphs may lack coherence.	May have random organization, lacking internal paragraph coherence and using few or inappropriate transitions. Paragraphs may lack topic sentences or main ideas, or may be too general or too specific to be effective. Paragraphs may not all relate to paper's thesis.	No appreciable organization; lacks transitions and coherence.
<b>Interpretation &amp; analysis</b>	Interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions are exceptionally clear, precise and reveal a rich and insightful understanding of the assumptions, strategies and aims of the text, and/or the relation between these and broader philosophical or intellectual issues.	Interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions are clear, precise and reveal a robust understanding of the basic assumptions, strategies and aims of the text, and show independent ability to interpret and analyze the text/issues.	Interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions are mostly correct on all basic points and fit within standard or interpretations; these show an awareness of the basic assumptions, issues, and aims of the text, but not a developed or independent understanding of them.	Interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions reveal little or no awareness or understanding of the issues at stake in the text; or little or no interpretation/analysis.	There is an absence of interpretation and analysis and/or a failure to engage the text.
<b>Style</b>	Chooses words for their precise meaning and uses an appropriate level of specificity. Sentence style fits paper's audience and purpose. Sentences are varied, yet clearly structured and carefully focused, not long and rambling.	Generally uses words accurately and effectively, but may sometimes be too general. Sentences generally clear, well structured, and focused, though some may be awkward or ineffective.	Uses relatively vague and general words, may use some inappropriate language. Sentence structure generally correct, but sentences may be wordy, unfocused, repetitive, or confusing.	May be too vague and abstract, or very personal and specific. Usually contains several awkward or ungrammatical sentences; sentence structure is simple or monotonous.	Usually contains many awkward sentences, misuses words, employs inappropriate language.
<b>Mechanics</b>	Almost entirely free of spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors.	May contain a few errors, which may annoy the reader but not impede understanding.	Usually contains several mechanical errors, which may temporarily confuse the reader but not impede the overall understanding.	Usually contains either many mechanical errors or important errors that block the reader's understanding and ability to see connections between thoughts.	Usually contains so many mechanical errors it is impossible for the reader to follow the thinking from sentence to sentence.

## SCHEDULE OF READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Week	Assigned Readings	Notes
<b>KANT'S THEORETICAL PHILOSOPHY</b>		
1 Sept. 8	<b>Background and Kant's Copernican Revolution</b> * Preface to the A-Edition of the <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i> (CPR Avii-xxii, pp. 99-105) * Preface to the B-Edition (CPR Bvii-xliv, pp. 106-124)	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * Terry Pinkard, "'Germany' and German Philosophy" * Frederick Beiser, "The Enlightenment and Idealism"
2 Sept. 15	<b>Kant's Distinctions</b> * "Introduction" to the B-Edition (CPR B1-30, pp. 136-152) * The Transcendental Aesthetic (CPR B33-36, pp. 172-174)	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * R. Lanier Anderson, "The Introduction to the <i>Critique</i> : Framing the Question"
3 Sept. 22	<b>Space and Time</b> * "The Transcendental Aesthetic" (CPR B37-73, pp. 174-192)	<b>EXERCISE DUE</b> <u>Recommended Readings:</u> * Kant, <i>Prolegomena</i> , §§6-13 * Andrew Janiak, " <a href="#">Kant's Views on Space and Time</a> "
4 Sept. 29	<b>The Conceptual Basis for Experience</b> * Introduction to "The Transcendental Logic" (CPR B74-76, pp. 193-194) * "On the Clue to the Discovery of all Pure Concepts of the Understanding" (CPR B91-113, pp. 204-216) * "On the Deduction of the Pure Concepts of the Understanding" (CPR B116-129, pp. 219-226) * <i>Prolegomena</i> , §§27-30	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * The B-Edition Transcendental Deduction (B129-143, pp. 245-252) * Beatrice Longuenesse, "Kant on A Priori Concepts: The Metaphysical Deduction of the Categories"
5 Oct. 6	<b>Metaphysics, Dialectic, and Freedom</b> * First Part of the "Transcendental Dialectic" (CPR B349-398, pp. 384-410) * "The Antinomy of Pure Reason" (CPR B432-453, pp. 459-469) * "Third Conflict of the Transcendental Ideas" (CPR B472-479, pp. 484-489) * "Resolution" of the Third Antinomy (CPR B560-569, pp. 532-537)	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * Allen W. Wood, "The Antinomies of Pure Reason"
<b>KANT'S PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY</b>		
6 Oct. 13	<b>Moral Worth and Acting from Duty</b> * Preface to the <i>Groundwork</i> (GW pp. 3-8) * "First Section" (GW pp. 9-21)	<u>Recommended Readings:</u>

		* J. B. Schneewind, "Why Study Kant's Ethics?" (GW pp. 83-91)
7 Oct. 20	<b>The Categorical Imperative</b> * "Second Section" (GW pp. 22-62) (Since this is a lengthy reading, page numbers to focus on will be provided.)	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * Allen W. Wood, "What Is Kantian Ethics?" (GW pp. 157-181)
<b>FICHTE</b>		
8 Oct. 27	<b>Fichte's Idealism</b> * <i>Some Lectures concerning the Scholar's Vocation</i> , "Preface" and "First Lecture: Concerning the Vocation of Man as Such" * "First Introduction to the <i>Wissenschaftslehre</i> "	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * Eckart Förster, "Fichte's 'Complete Revolution of the Mode of Thought'"
9 Nov. 3	<b>Fichte on Other Minds and the Concept of Right</b> * "Deduction of the Concept of Right" (Since this is a lengthy reading, page numbers to focus on will be provided.)	<b>PAPER #1 DUE</b>  <u>Recommended Readings:</u> * Allen W. Wood, "Freedom and Intersubjectivity"
<b>HEGEL</b>		
10 Nov. 10	<b>Hegel's Method and Account of Perception</b> * <i>Phenomenology of Spirit</i> , "Introduction" (§§73-89; HR pp. 70-78) * "Sense-Certainty" (§§90-110; HR pp. 79-86)	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * "Preface" (§§11-37, §§53-67; HR pp. 50-69) * Terry Pinkard, "Hegel's <i>Phenomenology and Logic: An Overview</i> " (up to p. 172) * HR pp. 133-8, 175-6 * HR pp. 290-297, 313-318
11 Nov. 17	<b>Self-Consciousness and the Absolute</b> * "Self-consciousness" (§§166-229; HR pp. 87-113) * "Spirit. Absolute Freedom and Terror" (§§584-595; HR pp. 114-119) * "Spirit. Absolute Knowing" (§§804-808; HR pp. 120-123)	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * Frederick Beiser, "Solipsism and Intersubjectivity"
12 Nov. 24	<b>Hegel on the Concepts of Right and Morality</b> * <i>Philosophy of Right</i> , "Preface and Introduction" (HR pp. 325-339; <i>Elements</i> pp. 20-23, §§1-2, §§4-7; §11, §§14-17, §§20-23, §§27-32) * "Abstract Right and Morality" (HR pp. 340-355; <i>Elements</i> §§34-36, §§41-49, §105, §113-141)	<u>Recommended Readings:</u> * Frederick Beiser, "Freedom and the Foundation of Right"

13 Dec. 1	<b>Hegel on the Ethical Life</b> * "Ethical Life" (HR pp. 356-366, 380-381, 397-399; <i>Elements</i> §§142-161, §§181-198, §§257-258, §§341- 347) * "Philosophy of History: Introduction" (HR pp. 400-404)	<b>PAPER #2 DUE</b>
--------------	---	---------------------