

# Kant and the Project of Enlightenment

By Curtis Bowman

Copyright © 1999, 2001, 2014

All rights reserved.

It is a grand and beautiful sight to see man emerge somehow from nothing by his own efforts; dissipate, by the light of his reason, the shadows in which nature had enveloped him; rise above himself; soar by means of his mind into the heavenly regions; traverse, like the sun, the vast expanse of the universe with giant steps; and, what is even grander and more difficult, return to himself in order to study man and know his nature, his duties, and his end.

– Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on the Sciences and the Arts* [1]

## I. Introduction

We are all familiar with the approach to Kant's writings which sees them as providing "answers" to various philosophical problems. Thus, for instance, the first *Critique*, specifically the Transcendental Aesthetic and Analytic, "answers" Hume's doubts about causation. And the *Groundwork*, especially sections one and two, "answers" Mill and other utilitarians by providing a response to problems associated with their attempts to establish the principle of utility as the fundamental principle of morality from which we are to derive all of our particular duties. Other aspects of Kant's philosophy are employed in similar ways in other contexts. For example, Kant's criticisms of the ontological argument are debated in the philosophy of religion, and his claim that there are no principles of taste is used to buttress certain positions in contemporary aesthetics. Further instances of this practice could be easily brought forward.

This way of reading Kant is not necessarily objectionable because his writings can certainly be used in this fashion. Such usage is testimony to Kant's greatness as a philosopher. But such an approach, which I dub (for lack of a better term) "analytic historiography," leaves much to be desired. It is primarily driven by concerns found in the history of analytic philosophy which do not always match those of Kant himself. Thus it tends to deflect our attention from the more basic concerns of his thought, which is not to say that it (or analytic philosophy itself) is somehow false or illegitimate: it either employs Kant's thought for ends other than his own or reduces the ambitions motivating his thought to those of analytical philosophers looking for material in their efforts to solve problems in analytical philosophy.

In this lecture I shall try to reposition Kant's thought in a way which will more clearly bring out its motivations, and which will help to explain why his ideas are of enduring interest to those inside and outside of the analytical tradition. I shall argue that the greatest influence on Kant's thought is not Hume, as we have long been led to believe, but rather Rousseau, and that the influence of Rousseau is the guiding force behind Kant's Critical philosophy. Kant's ambition, I claim, is to formulate the project of Enlightenment: that is, to develop a metaphysics and ethics of autonomy inspired by Rousseau's reflections on human nature and freedom.

To achieve this end, I shall focus my attention on three groups of writings: (1) Rousseau's writings from the early 1760's, specifically *Emile* (1762) and *The Social Contract* (1762); (2) Kant's posthumously published remarks on Rousseau (1764-1766), written and interleaved in his personal copy of his *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime* (1764); and (3) Kant's Critical writings from the 1780's. In the first section of this paper I shall discuss the relationship between Rousseau and Kant, especially as it relates to the project of Enlightenment, and Rousseau's views on freedom and morality, especially the notion of the general will, which I claim is a precursor of Kant's categorical imperative. Then in the second section I shall sketch out Kant's metaphysics and ethics of autonomy.

## **II. The Project of Enlightenment**

To repeat a famous question, what is enlightenment? Kant answers as follows:

Enlightenment is man's emergence from his self-imposed immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one's understanding without guidance from another. This immaturity is self-imposed when its cause lies not in lack of understanding, but in lack of resolve and courage to use it without guidance from another. [2]

This quotation comes from Kant's 1784 essay "What is Enlightenment?" and thus was written while Kant was in the process of working out the Critical philosophy. It articulates the chief motivation of the Critical philosophy: that is, the development of a system of human freedom, both in theoretical and practical matters. Thus we are to accept only those beliefs found acceptable to reason; custom and authority are no court of appeal for theoretical matters. And we are to lead lives in pursuit of autonomy in which the chief goal of human action is the realization and maximization of human freedom (understood as self-imposed lawful behavior). In other words, we are to be our own masters in both theory and practice.

In "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Intent," another essay from 1784, Kant pursues this notion of self-mastery further:

[Man] should not be led by instinct, nor be provided for and instructed by ready-made knowledge; instead, he should produce everything for himself. [3]

Man is an animal that . . . has need of a master. For he certainly abuses his freedom in relation to his equals, and although as a rational creature he desires a law that establishes boundaries for everyone's freedom, his selfish animal propensities induce him to except himself from them wherever he can. He thus requires a master who will break his self-will and force him to obey a universally valid will, whereby everyone can be free. Where is he to find this master? . . . The supreme guarantor should be just in himself and still be a man. [4]

Though these two essays are merely "popular" essays – and we know that Kant considered the popular style inadequate for serious philosophy – we should take them seriously. They explicitly and succinctly articulate the goals of the Critical philosophy in a way that the Critical writings themselves often fail to do. Think of the Critical philosophy as being in the service of a particular conception of humanity: the enlightened person is rational and autonomous, accepting nothing without a reason, never acting without a reason, always pursuing his or her freedom and the freedom of others. This is, of course, an ideal, one to be pursued but perhaps never fully attained. Having briefly sketched this picture, we must turn our attention to its origin. Where does this conception come from? Rousseau, I believe, is the chief inspiration for this picture.

In his posthumously published remarks written into his copy of *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, Kant famously declares his indebtedness to Rousseau:

I am myself by inclination a seeker after truth [*Forscher*]. I feel a consuming thirst for knowledge and an eager restlessness to advance in it, as well as satisfaction in every acquisition. There was a time when I believed that this alone could constitute the honor of mankind, and I despised the rabble who know nothing. Rousseau set me right. This blind preference disappeared; I learned to respect men, and I would find myself far more useless than the common workingman if I did not believe that this consideration could confer value to all others to establish the rights of mankind. [5]

Kant does not explain how Rousseau set him right, but he offers us a few hints in some other remarks. In three separate notes he writes the following:

Rousseau discovered first and foremost beneath the diversity of the received forms of humanity their deeply hidden nature. [6]

Rousseau's main goal is that the upbringing of children be free and that a free person be formed. [7]

The thought of inequality also makes men unequal. Only the doctrine of Rousseau can make even the most learned philosopher with his knowledge an honest man and, unaided by religion, not consider himself better than the common man. [8]

These passages stress what all humans share, what gives them value: that is, freedom and equality. These two notions are largely absent from Kant's early writings. These three remarks imply that Kant no longer despises the common man because everyone has the capacity to act freely and to treat each other as an equal.

Freedom and equality are the most important notions in Rousseau's writings. Rousseau is obsessed by the fact that we are born free and equal yet corrupted by society in such a way that we pursue useless things, that we insist on our differences as custom and snobbery dictate we should, and that we turn our surroundings into a miserable arena for the playing out of our petty jealousies and rivalries, none of which are native to us. We make ourselves miserable, creating a world that stifles and perverts us: that is, an alienated world, as later philosophers come to call it, a world of our own creation, but one not in the service of our own true ends, i.e., the preservation and expansion of freedom. As Rousseau famously said at the beginning of *The Social Contract*, "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains" [9].

In his book *Emile* Rousseau imagines himself as the tutor of a young boy named Emile. His task is to educate Emile to withstand the impositions of a society that would make him weak and servile. As an infant he is not to be swaddled in restrictive clothing. He is to learn to walk in a field, falling down as often as necessary to teach him how to pick himself up. He will no doubt be bruised, but, says Rousseau, "The well-being of freedom makes up for many wounds" [10]. Emile is not to be educated by reading but by doing. He will learn how to measure distances, not by studying mathematics, but by running races, thereby learning how to judge distances visually. Only at the end of childhood, prior to puberty, is he to be given his first book, and it will be Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, that Bible of self-reliance. As a young man he will learn a trade, preferably carpentry, so that he can earn a living with his own hands should other kinds of livelihood fail him.

The purpose of this education is to make him happy by keeping his life natural and simple. The useless desires of a vain society will not assail him; his simple life will keep him healthy; and his capacity for self-reliance and independence will keep him free:

For him, all that he desires is within his reach. Sufficient unto himself and free of prejudices, on whom will he be dependent? He has arms, health, moderation, few needs, and the means of satisfying them. Nurtured in the most absolute liberty, he conceives of no ill greater than servitude. [11]

This education is ultimately self-imposed, says Rousseau, for when taught in the proper way, Emile sees the validity of what he is being taught and comes to recognize and accept it for himself. Several maxims sum up the somewhat fanciful spectacle of Emile's education in more concrete terms:

The heart receives laws only from itself. By wanting to enchain it, one releases it; one enchains it by leaving it free. [12]

All passions are good when one remains their master; all are bad when one lets oneself be subjected to them. [13]

Freedom is found in no form of government; it is in the heart of the free man. [14]

All of these remarks point to a doctrine usually associated with Kant: inclination is opposed to freedom, and we act freely when we impose limitations on our inclinations ourselves. And such self-imposed restraint is what it is to be autonomous.

For Rousseau, all of this is set in a theological context. A section of *Emile* entitled the "Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar" [15] develops a metaphysics similar to Kant's in many ways. According to the vicar, we are spontaneous creatures, free of determination from the natural world. The world shows signs of design and order, and therefore we can infer that it is the product of an intelligent will. The moral life is the only thing which makes us well-pleasing to God, and for it we will be rewarded in a future life. Nothing but natural religion (what is now called deism) is truly acceptable to reason; all other forms of religion are the product of the corrupting influences of superstition and society. There are no particular revelations, no miracles, no special sources of religious insight: natural religion is available to everyone through the unprejudiced use of his or her reason.

The chief difference between Rousseau and Kant on the topic of religion is that Kant routinely denies that we can prove God's existence by means of the argument from design; instead, he says, we have morally compelling reasons for believing that God's existence is a real possibility, although at times he claims that such reasons allow us to assume that God in fact exists. Otherwise, however, their attitudes towards organized religions are remarkably similar – that is, completely negative – and for the same reason. Morality is something we impose on ourselves, not a way of life which we follow because some divine being commands us to adopt it. Thus the moral life is the autonomous life, freely imposed by us on our ourselves because we recognize its legitimate claims on us.

But the individual moral agent always lives in a social context, regardless of how self-reliant and independent he or she may be. How can people like Emile live and thrive in society? That is, what must society be like if freedom is to survive? How can freedom be extended from the "heart of the free man" to government? Here we turn to *The Social Contract*.

Rousseau's *Social Contract* is infamous for the difficulties which it imposes on its readers. Some see it as an application of social contract theory to the problem of legitimating majority rule; others see it as romantic collectivism, in which the individual is somehow swept up in the

collectivity and thereby made free; still others see it as a blueprint for totalitarianism. I certainly do not claim to be able to resolve these difficulties; I lack the competence to do so. What I want to do, instead, is to provide a Kantian reading of *The Social Contract*: that is, a reading intended to bring out Kant's indebtedness to this work, without actually claiming that Kant saw his own ideas as an interpretation of Rousseau's book.

I suggest that we read *The Social Contract* as we read Plato's *Republic*: that is, not as a handbook of practical advice for establishing a just state, but rather as an imaginative depiction of a just state. And in Rousseau's case this means a state in which all of its members are free creatures who extend their freedom to others in a lawlike way.

Rousseau describes the essence of the social compact regulating society as follows: "Each of us places his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will; and as one we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole" [16]. Though we agree to give ourselves up to the direction of the general will, we sometimes fail to follow its dictates because our private will, present in us as individuals, conflicts with our general will, present in us as citizens. This conflict comes about largely through our inability to curb our desires and instincts.

What are we to do in cases of conflict? Follow our private will or follow the general will? Rousseau says, ". . . in order for the social compact to avoid being an empty formula, it tacitly entails the commitment – which alone can give force to the others – that whoever refuses to obey the general will will be forced to do so by the entire body. This means merely that he will be forced to be free" [17]. Passages like this one give ammunition to those who consider *The Social Contract* a blueprint for totalitarianism, and in a fairly obvious way. How can we be forced to be free? This sounds like a contradiction.

Some of the sting can be taken out of this infamous passage if we read it carefully. Rousseau writes that the passage from the state of nature to the civil state produces great changes in us: "Only then, when the voice of duty replaces physical impulse and right replaces appetite, does man, who had hitherto taken only himself into account, find himself forced to act upon other principles and to consult his reason before listening to his inclinations" [18]. If this is intended to be a realistic description of what actually happens to individuals as they enter into civil society, then it seems not merely false but hopelessly naive. We are just as guided by "appetite" inside as outside of the civil state. Has the civil state changed anything in this regard?

Rousseau thinks that it has because he conceives of the state of nature as one in which an individual pursues his or her natural liberty, i.e., follows his or her inclinations unhindered by any concern for others. In civil society, however, we are surrounded by others, and thus we must take them into account in our actions. Limitations on our natural liberty thus ensue. But if the citizens of the state are moral – and they are *assumed* to be so, given the goals of *The Social*

*Contract* as I interpret them – then these limitations are self-imposed and consented to. Therefore, turning away from the largely self-directed individual will to follow the dictates of the general will, the voice of reason, involves no loss of freedom at all. In fact, it is the only proper way for rational creatures who value freedom to act: "For to be driven by appetite alone is slavery, and obedience to the law one has prescribed for oneself is liberty" [19]. Civil society ennobles us by "forcing" us to consult reason in our efforts to regulate our relations with others. In other words, we must use reason once we leave the state of nature, and since we agree to abide by the dictates of civil society, we agree to obey the general will, and so we can be "forced" to be free with actually becoming unfree as a result.

The social compact, through the self-imposition of law, extends freedom to everyone, thereby creating the equality and political freedom that we expect in a democratic state:

. . . the fundamental compact . . . substitutes a moral and legitimate equality to whatever physical inequality nature may have been able to impose upon men, and that, however unequal in force or intelligence they may be, men all become equal by convention and by right. [20]

For by its nature the private will tends toward having preferences, and the general will toward equality. [21]

There is often a great deal of difference between the will of all and the general will. The latter considers only the general interest, whereas the former considers private interest and is merely the sum of private wills. [22]

Because the freedom which we allow for ourselves is extended to everyone else in the state in a lawlike way, we are all free, and thus no one loses any freedom worthy of the name by belonging to the civil state.

Rousseau at times writes as if the general will is simply the outcome of the majority's consenting to something. This claim, coupled with the claim that the general will can never err, often leads Rousseau's readers to think that he is advocating a tyranny of the majority, a democratic tyranny [23]. But this reaction, however natural it may be, is mistaken. The general will, says Rousseau, is expressed by a "sufficiently informed populace" [24] free from the harmful influences of excessive self-interest, vanity, superstition, and so on. Therefore, the general will is not simply the "will of all," the will of the majority of citizens in all circumstances. Instead, when it is described in this fashion, the general will sounds more like a fundamental moral principle operating in conditions of impartiality and sincerity rather than a mere expression of the will of the majority. And, given Rousseau's constant condemnation of his contemporaries, this makes perfect sense: since he believes that they have been corrupted in various ways, he certainly does not advocate giving them the vote so that they can tyrannize the uncorrupted few.

The general will could no more err in Rousseau's eyes than the categorical imperative could in Kant's. And for Rousseau the general will is the fundamental moral principle because it takes what everyone values above all else – namely, freedom – and extends to everyone else:

Why is the general will always right, and why do all constantly want the happiness of each of them, if not because everyone applies the word *each* to himself and thinks of himself as he votes for all? [25]

It should be seen from this that what makes the will general is not so much the number of votes as the common interest that unites them, for in this institution each person necessarily submits himself to the conditions he imposes on others, an admirable accord between interest and justice which bestows on common deliberations a quality of equity that disappears when any particular matter is discussed . . . . [26]

There is no need to ask "how one is both free and subject to the laws, since they are merely the record of our own wills" [27]. Therefore, the decision to submit to the general will is supremely rational because by doing so we establish, maintain, and extend the realm of human freedom.

### **III. Kant's Metaphysics and Ethics of Autonomy**

In the foregoing reflections on Rousseau I have discussed various ideas as if they leapt off the page and announced themselves in an unambiguous fashion. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth. Rousseau's writings are rhetorically powerful and exciting, but argumentatively slipshod. He is often difficult to pin down, and thus his works have elicited wildly diverging interpretations. If, however, my interpretation turns out to be wrong, I must admit that I would not be too bothered by such an outcome. My intention has been to provide a Kantian reading of Rousseau, one which helps us to understand Kant. Hence the correctness of that reading is not much of an issue.

In the remainder of this section I hope to show that Kant's Critical philosophy is a more carefully worked out version of many of the ideas discussed earlier – a less exciting, more boring Rousseau, if you will. In the previous section I tried to establish Kant's indebtedness to Rousseau, something which most scholars are willing to concede. Now I want to trace out that indebtedness to see how it influences the shape of the Critical philosophy.

Kant's transcendental idealism, the doctrinal core of the first *Critique* in particular and the Critical philosophy in general, is doing many things at once, but for our purposes the most important is its efforts to demonstrate the reality of transcendental freedom, i.e., the absence of natural necessity in the origins of human action. Kant employs the distinction between appearances and things in themselves – a distinction which is announced and argued for in the Transcendental Aesthetic and Analytic of the first *Critique* – first to establish the possibility of



transcendental freedom in the Third Antinomy of the first *Critique*, and then to prove its reality in the Transcendental Analytic of the second *Critique*. The third antinomy opposes the claims of natural necessity and freedom and reaches an impasse until Kant appeals to the doctrine of transcendental idealism. Both claims may be true: natural necessity in the world of appearances and freedom in the noumenal world. The Transcendental Deduction has established that necessity rules in the world of appearances, the phenomenal world. And at the very least the possibility of freedom in the noumenal world has not been disproved. So we might be free.

But the Transcendental Analytic of the second *Critique* proves the reality of transcendental freedom, says Kant, because moral imputability makes sense only if we are free. As the famous saying goes, 'ought' implies 'can'. So Kant claims to have shown how transcendental freedom is not only possible but also actual. This is an advance over the "Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar" where Rousseau simply asserted the existence of freedom. Kant has taken Rousseau's intuition and embedded it in a sophisticated metaphysical and moral system, thereby increasing the plausibility of the claim to freedom in human action.

The doctrine of transcendental freedom is not intended to establish the existence of autonomy, the ability to be a law to oneself, but it is intended to make autonomy possible. This conception of freedom, however, was not always advocated by Kant. In his early ethical writings Kant was a moral sense theorist much like Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, and Hume. In his 1763/64 work *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime* Kant denies that morality is based on abstract principles:

. . . true virtue can be grafted only upon principles such that the more general they are, the more sublime and noble it becomes. These principles are not speculative rules, but the consciousness of a feeling that lives in every human breast . . . I believe that I sum it all up when I say that it is *the feeling of the beauty and the dignity of human nature*. The first is a ground of universal affection, the second of universal esteem; and if this feeling had the greatest perfection in some human heart, this man would of course love and prize even himself, but only so far as he is one of all those over whom his broadened and noble feeling is spread. Only when one subordinates his own inclination to one so expanded can our charitable impulses be used proportionately and bring about the noble bearing that is the beauty of virtue. [28]

This position is quite different from the later position of the categorical imperative, and in the writings and notes of the 1760's and 1770's we see a slow evolution towards this later position.

Kant's Prize Essay of 1763/64 adds principles to the content of morality, e.g., I ought to further the greatest total perfection, or I ought to act in accordance with the will of God [29]. Thus normative force is added to Kant's account of morality. Feelings about the good are supplemented by the demand that we realize the good, whatever it may be.

The concern with freedom as the origin of morality slowly begins to appear in the notes of the 1760's and 1770's. i.e., after Rousseau so decisively influenced Kant. (These are found in volume 19 of the *Akademie* edition of Kant's works.) Kant begins to associate morality with freedom under laws. There he frequently speaks of *eine allgemeine Willkühr* or *eine gemeinschaftliche Willkühr*, i.e., a general will, as the origin of morality which makes possible the harmony of individual wills – a formulation very much in Rousseau's spirit. In R6725, a note from around 1772, Kant speaks for the first time of a categorical imperative as the source of morality because it imposes laws on our freedom. In R6767, another note from around 1772-1775, Kant baldly states that morality is freedom under laws – a formulation even more in Rousseau's spirit.

In his *Lectures on Ethics*, given in the early 1780's, Kant says the following about the value of freedom:

The inherent value of the world . . . is freedom in accordance with a will which is not necessitated to action. Freedom is thus the inner value of the world. [30]

But only a freedom regulated by rules possesses such value:

Man alone is free; his actions are not regulated by any . . . subjectively necessitating principle; if they were, he would not be free . . . Therefore the proper use of freedom is the supreme rule. What then is the condition under which freedom is restricted? It is the law . . . He who subjects his person to his inclinations, acts contrary to the essential end of humanity; for as a free being he must not be subjected to inclinations, but ought to determine them in the exercise of his freedom; and being a free agent he must have a rule, which is the essential end of humanity. [31]

Rousseau's vision of self-imposed legislation as the expression of human freedom is transformed by Kant into the doctrine of the moral law.

Freedom is our end and morality is the means to realize it. But we will not merely our own freedom but also the freedom of others since we are imposing law on ourselves: what we will for ourselves we also will for others. Rousseau's social compact is replaced by Kant's kingdom of ends:

For rational beings all stand under the *law* that each of them should treat himself and all others, *never merely as a means*, but always *at the same time as an end in himself*. But by so doing there arises a systematic union of rational beings under common objective laws – that is, a kingdom. [32]

Thus Kant envisions a moral kingdom in which all rational agents freely impose law on themselves, thus acting autonomously and thereby extending freedom to all other rational agents.

Finally, in the Transcendental Dialectic of the second *Critique* Kant turns to the question of the relationship of morality and religion. He argues that the concept of the highest good – the perfect proportion of happiness and virtue such that virtue causes happiness – is an end which is also a duty. If we are obliged to pursue this, then, he claims, it must be possible for us to do so. But this is the case only if we assume that God exists and that the soul is immortal. (Whether these are assumptions about real possibilities or assumptions to the effect that God actually exists and that the soul is actually immortal – this is an open question in Kant commentary. Different texts point to different interpretations [33].) This strategy, Kant's moral theology, preserves the autonomy of morality. It is not derived from religion; instead, the converse is true: religion is derived from morality.

#### IV. Conclusion

My somewhat breathless survey of Kant's thought reveals its indebtedness to Rousseau and, I hope, helps to clarify some of its intentions. The point of the Critical philosophy is to reformulate and reconstruct in a philosophically precise way Rousseau's reflections on human nature and freedom. Freedom is the ultimate source of value, and thus must be incorporated into our philosophical thinking. Kant's project is, first, to explain the possibility and actuality of transcendental freedom, the absence of natural necessity, in human action; second, to develop an account of autonomy as the source of human value and dignity; and, third, to protect this account from the threat of outside imposition posed by religion. These three aspects of the project of Enlightenment, I maintain, make up part of what we find to be of enduring interest in Kant's thought. Other concerns, like the ones mentioned at the beginning of this paper, are no doubt relevant and are to be respected. But they do not go very far in explaining why Kant's contemporaries were drawn to his thought (or repulsed by it, as the case may be). Reading his writings in light of the project of Enlightenment helps us to understand why Kant's writings were, after all, a product of the age of Enlightenment.

#### Notes

1. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Basic Political Writings*, tr. Donald Cress (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1987), p. 3.

2. Immanuel Kant, "What is Enlightenment?" in *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays*, tr. Ted Humphrey (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983), p. 41.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

4. *Ibid.*, 33-34.

5. Marie Rischmüller (ed.), *Bemerkungen in den "Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen*

*und Erhabenen"* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1991), p. 38.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 48.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 124.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 130.

9. Rousseau, *The Basic Political Writings*, p. 141.

10. Rousseau, *Emile*, tr. Allan Bloom (Basic Books, 1979), p. 78.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 244.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 234.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 445.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 473.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 266-313.

16. Rousseau, *The Basic Political Writings*, p. 148.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 150-151.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 153-154.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 155.

23. *Ibid.*, pp. 155-156.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 156.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 157.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 158.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 161.

28. Kant, *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, tr. John Goldthwait (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), p. 60.

29. Kant, *Selected Pre-Critical Writings*, tr. G. B. Kerferd and D. E. Walford (New York: Manchester University Press, 1968), p. 32.

30. Kant, *Lectures on Ethics*, tr. Louis Infield (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1980), p. 122.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 122.

32. Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, tr. H. J. Paton (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964). p. 101.

33. For a detailed discussion of this issue, see Paul Guyer, "In praktischer Absicht: Kants Begriff der Postulate der reinen praktischen Vernunft," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 104 (1997): 1-18.

---

*Last revised on April 16, 2014.*